



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE SCANSION OF MEDIAEVAL HEBREW POETRY

BY B. HALPER, Dropsie College.

### I

ONE of the essential characteristics of poetic compositions, apart from the aesthetic beauty of their contents, is the harmonious structure of their outward form. Besides polishing every sentence, poets throughout all ages sought to arrange syllables in such a way as to obtain a rhythmic flow. As formerly poems were composed for recitation, they had to be made pleasant to the ear, and hence metre and rhyme developed. Incidentally metre and rhyme, especially the former, helped to preserve the poems from being corrupted in the mouths of the reciters. For in most cases when one word is substituted for another the metre is disturbed.

In mediaeval Hebrew poetry, owing to the peculiar history of this branch of literature, an accurate knowledge of scansion is of vital importance. Composed by writers whose aim was to imitate the Arabian poets, the Hebrew *Dīwāns* were up till recently copied and edited by men who had little or no knowledge of Arabic prosody. The texts were in many cases corrupted beyond recognition, and it is only with the help of the metre that we can hope to restore the original lines as they left the hands of the author. Thus as an apparatus for textual criticism a knowledge of the metres is indispensable. This know-

ledge, however, must be accurate, otherwise it is apt to mislead rather than guide us. It is exasperating to come across notes in modern editions of *Dīwāns*, where the editor informs us that he emended the text in accordance with the metre, when the metre was entirely misunderstood by him.

Alive to the importance of this subject, Jewish writers, at different times and from different points of view, made many attempts to describe and classify the metres employed by the Hebrew poets whose mother tongue was Arabic. Foremost among early writers is Sa'adyā b. Dannān<sup>1</sup> who in his chapter on the metres<sup>2</sup> gives an exhaustive account of this subject. But although he may rightly be called a skilful versifier, and it must likewise be admitted that his Hebrew style, despite its slight harshness in many places, is quite fluent, he failed to grasp the fundamental principles of Arabic prosody. It is certainly true that he is versed in the language and literature of the Arabs. But it is equally true that he often misunderstands his models. To prove this assertion we need only mention the fact that Sa'adyā in the above-named chapter gives the following two verses as *Wāfir* and *Kāmil* respectively :<sup>3</sup>

(1) מִצֹּת אֲנָשִׁים בָּלֶם קְרֹאִים טְהוֹרִים

דְּבָרֵי חֲכָמִים דָּרְשׁוּ טַעֲמִים בְּרוּרִים

(2) בְּרַבִּי נִפְשִׁי אֶת יְהוָה כִּי הוּא אֱלֹהֵינוּ

הוּא שְׁלָחָה אֶת לַעֲשׂוֹת חֲפָצוֹ מִמַּעַן קְרֹשׁוֹ

<sup>1</sup> The transcription Danan is certainly inaccurate, as in Hebrew it is דָּנָן. On analogy of many proper nouns spelt in this way, as, for instance, Ḥassān, Ḥajjāj, I think the correct pronunciation is Dannān.

<sup>2</sup> *Meleket ha-Šir*, ed. Neubauer, 1865.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 14, 15.

He even misunderstands the significations of some of the metres. Thus it is well known that Basīṭ means *extended, outspread*. Yet Sa'adyā translates it into Hebrew by פשוט *simple*.<sup>4</sup> Now *basīṭ* happens to signify 'simple' in colloquial Arabic and in philosophic terminology, but the very compound character of this metre excludes its being called by that name. As an apology for Sa'adyā it may be stated that some Arabian writers committed the same error. He renders *ramal* by חול *sand*,<sup>5</sup> confusing *raml* with *ramal*.

In recent years this subject was again taken up, and in some cases treated more scientifically. But the remarkable feature about it is that, although in a matter of this nature only one interpretation is possible, unanimity of opinion has not been secured. H. Brody, who has devoted a great deal of energy to this investigation, and has done praiseworthy work in the field of mediaeval Hebrew poetry, published a pamphlet entitled *Studien zu den Dichtungen Jehuda ha-Levis. I. Über die Metra der Versgedichte* (Berlin, 1895). In this treatise he gives a scientific account of the introduction and development of the Arabic metres in the Holy Tongue. Had the treatment of the various metres been accurate Brody would have left nothing to be desired. Unfortunately, however, in many cases his classification of the metres is based on opinions which cannot be substantiated, and he was therefore driven to resort to anomalous vocalizations. The reason of his failure to give a final solution to this simple matter must be attributed to his having resorted to theory

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11. It is unlikely that Sa'adyā meant the rare usage of פִּשְׁטָה *he stretched*.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

instead of practice. Instead of studying the Arabic metres at first hand, he merely consulted Freytag. Now Freytag's *Darstellung der arabischen Verskunst*, though it was excellent for its time (it was published in 1830), has long ago become antiquated. Moreover, he follows Sa'adyā too blindly, and takes over the errors of the latter. It is through these circumstances that he is led to state<sup>6</sup> that the feet *mufā'ilatun* and *mutafā'ilun* are impossible in Hebrew, since two moving *šwās* cannot follow each other. As a matter of fact the two consecutive short syllables of these two feet are not the rule in Arabic, they may only be substituted for a long one. A full description of this point will be given later on when Kāmil and Wāfir will be dealt with, and my contention will be proved beyond a shadow of a doubt. It is also his opinion that a *waṭīd mafrūk* must be excluded, because there can be no *šwā mobile* at the end of the word. But no line in Arabic poetry ends in a short syllable, for, as is well known, every vowel concluding the line is regarded as long, though it may be naturally short. It is thus evident that all the forms can be easily transferred to Hebrew, only some optional combinations, such as the substitution of two short syllables for a long one, could not always be employed. Altogether, whenever the Arab poet had the option of using a long or short syllable, the Hebrew poet, for reasons which will become apparent later on, almost invariably preferred to employ a long syllable. This, of course, accounts for the fact that has often been observed, that the Hebrew metre is less fluctuating than the Arabic. If any further proof were needed to show that Brody's treatise is inadequate it would be enough to call attention

<sup>6</sup> *Metra*, p. 21.

to the fact that two out of the four metres which he<sup>7</sup> terms *unbestimmte*, and states that he cannot trace them, are well known in Arabic: (c) is Munsariḥ, and (d) is the shorter Kāmil. There are also a few metres in ha-Levi's Dīwān of which Brody takes no account at all.

It is my object to give here a concise account of the metres employed by mediaeval Hebrew writers. As by far the greater bulk of the metres are taken directly from Arabic, I shall quote examples from both languages. In order to prove my statements, I shall not refer to authorities, but shall show the practical application of the rules. After all, the concrete embodiment of abstract rules gives the reader a better opportunity of judging for himself than a mere reference to a famous authority. I shall also make use of this occasion to explain some obscure passages which have not been hitherto satisfactorily treated, especially those on which light may be thrown by quoting parallels from Arabic poetry.

That the Hebrew metres consisting of vowels and moving *šwās* were directly borrowed from the Arabs, and are the product of a conscious imitation, is a truism which needs only to be formally stated to be appreciated. Yet the question may be raised how far we can rely on the metres of the Arab poets to guide us in analysing the poetical creations of their Hebrew followers. For it may well be the case that, while attempting to introduce a foreign metre into Hebrew, the representatives of the Spanish school of Hebrew poets failed to grasp the fundamental principles upon which Arabic metres are based. Sa'adyā b. Dannān ought to be a warning example. We in our turn should therefore be wrong in applying

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 48, 49.

the rigid rules governing the Arabic metre to its Hebrew offspring. If we wish to understand our poets we must take account of their errors. We must look at things from their point of view, not from ours. We have to analyse the metres as they are, and not as they should have been. To this we may reply that whereas later writers failed to comprehend the rhythmic flow of Arabic poetry, the earlier poets who are responsible for popularizing these metres in Hebrew, have fully understood them. Judah ha-Levi employed almost every kind of the Arabic metres with great skill. And even in his poems—which are not numerous at all, and were probably composed at the later part of his life, when he repented having followed the ‘customs’ of a people whom he detested—which are in metres not conforming with the hard and fast rules of the Arabs, it is easily seen that they are intentional deviations. This is likewise true in the case of Samuel ha-Nagid, Ibn Gabirol, Moses Ibn Ezra, Abraham Ibn Ezra, and al-Ḥarizi.

Reproaches have repeatedly been heaped upon the representatives of that school of poets for having introduced into the Holy Tongue a system of foreign metres which are against its inherent characteristics, and thereby corrupted its purity. The latter part of this complaint cannot be substantiated. It may readily be conceded that a metre depending on the quantity of the syllables does not contribute to render Hebrew poetry rhythmic, since that language possesses no short vowels, as far as quantity is concerned. To substitute the *šwā mobile* for a short vowel is an artificial device which could have made no impression on the ear when the poem was recited. It may be compared with the method of writing acrostics.

One may perhaps be led to admire the skill of the writer, but the poem is not made sublimer in tone. On the other hand, we must repudiate the assertion that the Spanish poets corrupted the purity of Hebrew style. As regards the rudiments of languages we can safely say that all are equal in being against all metres. The tendency of metre is to arrange words differently from their natural order. Hence it is absurd to consider a particular system of metres more suitable for a language than another. Poetry, however, likes to be fettered. Pegasus seems to run more freely when chained. This may sound paradoxical, but is nevertheless true. The very restraint seems to stimulate the poetical mind. This is the reason why poetry is more polished than prose. There are certain frames of mind which can only become active when their area is limited and restricted. The Arabs with their characteristic insight call poetry *manẓūm* ('strung' or 'joined') and prose *manṭūr* ('scattered'). Oscar Wilde candidly admits that a thought often suggested itself to him while in search for a rhyme. We have therefore no cause to regret that the Spanish school of poets adopted a system of metres which apparently deprived them of their freedom. For it awakened their energies, and served as an excellent stimulus. The result of that activity was gems of thought and polished style.

I shall now proceed to give a short account of the system of metres employed by the Arabs. Like those of the Greek and Latin poets, the Arabic metres are based on the quantity of syllables, that is to say, a number of long and short syllables occur regularly according to certain rules. Although the earliest Arabic poetic literature transmitted to us dates after the Christian era, it is quite



certain that neither the Greeks nor the Romans influenced the Arab poets. For the Arabic metre sprang forth in the desert, and the desert-dweller even to-day repels any foreign influence. It is, however, a striking feature that there are many points of resemblance between the systems of prosody of these literatures. Evidently the poetic instinct works independently in the same direction among different races. The Arab poets divide syllables into two classes: (1) those that are long, and (2) those that are short. A long syllable is one which contains a long vowel, or is closed. To use an English example, *go* and *got* would be considered long syllables in Arabic. A short syllable is one which contains a short vowel and is open. A verse is divided into two hemistichs each containing a certain amount of feet. A foot consists of a certain number of syllables, short and long, disposed in a certain order in accordance with the rules appertaining to them. Feet may be roughly divided into two chief classes:

- (1) Composed of four syllables ;
- (2) Composed of three syllables.

Feet of four syllables have many variations:

(a) *Diiambus* is the one occurring most frequently, and its normal form is — ∪ — ∪.<sup>8</sup> Here, as in the Greek and Latin literatures, the first syllable may be long, and its form is then — ∪ — —. The Arabs call this foot *mustaf'ilun*. This foot may sometimes be reduced to — ∪ ∪ — or — ∪ ∪ ∪.

(b) *Epitritus tertius*, consisting of a spondee and iambus. Its normal form is — ∪ — —. The first syllable may be

<sup>8</sup> These lines are throughout to be read from right to left, as they are to be applied to a language written in that direction.

substituted by two short ones, and the foot is then  $- \cup - \cup \cup$ . On account of this peculiarity the Arabs call it *mutafā'ilun*.

(c) *Epitritus primus*, consisting of an iambus and spondee. Its ordinary form is  $- - - \cup$ . The third syllable may be substituted by two short ones, when the foot becomes  $- \cup \cup - \cup$ . This foot is known as *mufā'ilatun*.

(d) *Ionicus a minore*, consisting of a pyrrhic and spondee. Its form is ordinarily  $- - \cup \cup$ . The first syllable may be long, and on this account the Arabs call it *fā'ilātun*.

(e) *Antispast*, consisting of an iamb and choree, and its form is  $\cup - - \cup$ . The last syllable is usually long, and hence its name is *mafā'ilun*. It may be changed into  $- \cup - \cup$ .

Of the feet consisting of three syllables the variations are naturally less.

(a) *Brachius*, whose normal form is  $\cup - \cup$ . The third syllable may be long, hence it is named *fa'ūlun*.

(b) *Anapaest*, whose normal form is  $- \cup \cup$ . The first syllable may be long, and hence its name is *fā'ilun*. In some cases this foot may be substituted by a spondee.

The hemistichs contain a certain number of these feet. A metre may be simple, composed of one class of feet, or compound, composed of two kinds of feet.

According to this principle all syllables in Hebrew are long, for, as is well known, in that language no short vowel can be open unless it has the accent. Then, according to the conception of mediaeval grammarians, accented syllables are long as far as metre is concerned. The short syllables, therefore, would have to be furnished by the light vowels which are extremely rare, and would scarcely

supply anything like a sufficient number. The *šwā mobile*, accordingly, had to be raised to its former glory, and given the rank of a short vowel. Arabic-speaking Jews probably did not fail to notice that many moving *šwās* in Hebrew correspond to short vowels in Arabic, and this influenced them to adopt this principle. The light vowel, together with the *šwā* which follows it, was in some cases regarded as a long syllable, as if the *šwā* were quiescent. But there are some passages, I think, in which the poets intended them to be considered as two short syllables. This fact has hitherto been overlooked. But if this obvious suggestion be adopted, the number of cases where a *šwā mobile* was taken for a quiescent would be appreciably reduced. There are a few rare instances in which the light vowel was employed as a long syllable and the *šwā* as a short one. These details will be pointed out later on when occasion arises.

Apart from the latitude which was allowed to the Arab poets in forming their verses, they frequently made use of poetical licence. Now that our dictionaries and grammars are based on those poetical monuments, we are not in position to realize the extent to which the Arabs took liberty with their language. But it is quite certain that many forms owe their existence to the fact that the poet wanted a certain arrangement of syllables. Thus if *yubliḡu* did not fit the metre, he simply changed it into *yuballigū*. Although lexicographers are careful to register all possible forms, a reader of poetry often comes across conjugations which are not to be found in the standard lexica. Then the broken plurals could not all have been used in practical life, and there can be no doubt that the multiplicity of forms existing of one noun is due to this circumstance.

When the first syllable of *ru'ātun* (broken plural of *rā'in*) had to be long, the poet simply made the word sound *ru"ātun*. There are also numerous cases where a *hamza* was changed into *waṣla*. The Hebrew poets, however, were less fortunately situated. They wrote in a dead language which had long become stereotyped. They were fettered by a masorah and a very limited vocabulary. Some of them were even too timid to use a word in the plural if its singular alone occurred in the Bible. It is only in extremely rare instances that we meet a post-biblical word or expression. They were afraid of being branded as ignoramuses or corrupters of the Holy Tongue. The poet wants to say יִפְּרֵי, but the metre requires a short syllable at the beginning of the word. It is quite natural for him to use the Pu'al and say יִפְּרֵי on the analogy of שִׁפְּרֵי and Isa. 19. 4. But a learned grammarian comes along with his concordance and conclusively proves that יִפְּרֵי does not exist in the Old Testament. Our admiration is aroused when we see that in spite of these discouraging circumstances the Spanish poets produced sublime verses which contain no flaws whatsoever. It makes us think with regret of the wealth which these gifted poets would have bestowed on the Hebrew language had it been alive and capable of being stretched. The poetic licence that the Hebrew poets sometimes allowed themselves was to regard a *šwā mobile* as *quiescent* and vice versa, and to use a word in a form which does not occur in the Bible. They were, of course, severely reproached for these aberrations by later grammarians.

It has justly been observed that the metre in Hebrew is more fixed, that is to say, it offers less option than the Arabic. The reason of this phenomenon is not far to seek.

We have seen that the Arabs often used a short syllable instead of a long one. This is an option which the Hebrew poets could easily dispense with, for in Arabic the short and long syllables occur in equal proportion, whereas *šwās* must occur much more rarely than all the other vowels put together. Then the substitution of two short syllables for a long one is only possible in the case of a light vowel and the *šwā* which follows it. The Hebrew poets, therefore, preferred to use as many long syllables as possible. We shall see later on that two important metres which are extremely frequent in Arabic occur rarely in Hebrew, simply because too many short syllables are required. Then there is also a psychological reason which will account for the fact why the Hebrew poet preferred to adhere to a fixed form. The imitator likes to observe as strictly as possible all restrictions imposed on him. It is his desire to out-Herod Herod. The Arabian poet had sufficient confidence in himself, and realized that nothing will be detracted from his value if he breaks the monotony of having all feet identical in form. But the Hebrew poet hesitated in resorting to variations, lest his skill as a versifier should be questioned. Nevertheless deviations do exist in Hebrew poetry. Editors were unnecessarily driven to resort to anomalous vocalizations and even to emendations. Brody<sup>9</sup> recognizes this fact, but makes wrong use of it. He is right in quoting Freytag that *mustaf'ilun* (— ∪ — —) may become *mufā'ilun* (— ∪ — ∪), and yet he cannot see his way to vocalize יִרְפִּינִי and פְּתָרָה instead of יִרְפִּינִי and פְּתָרָה which is in the middle of a sentence.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, in his edition of Judah ha-Levi's *Dīwān*<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Metra*, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 39. Cp. below, p. 206.

<sup>11</sup> See especially II, notes, p. 122.

he observes that *mustaf'ilun* may have a *šwā mobile* prefixed to it, that is to say, it may become — ٠' — ٠. This assertion is utterly groundless, for the Arabs never permitted that. No poet is recorded to have allowed himself to make use of this privilege of giving *mustaf'ilun* more than four syllables. The fundamental rules of Arabic prosody permit the shortening of a foot or the substitution of two short syllables for a long one, but never tolerate the addition of a superfluous syllable. Should such a principle be adopted, we could take almost any piece of prose and make it agree with any metre we choose. I shall revert to this point when treating of each metre individually.

## II

Writers on prosody in Hebrew and Arabic are at variance as to the arrangement of the several metres. This subject was approached by Oriental writers from peculiar points of view, and every one gave the order which suited his preconceived theory. It is, however, a minor question which need not detain us here. I prefer to adopt the order which is in accordance with the relative frequency the metres occur in Arabic.

Sixteen metres are recognized by the Arabs, four of which may be called favourites which are seldom, if ever, absent from any *Dīwān*. These four are: *Ṭawīl*, *Basīt*, *Kāmil*, and *Wāfir*.

### 1. *Ṭawīl*, *long*.

(a) This is a compound metre consisting of four feet in each hemistich, two of which feet are *mafā'ilun*, and the other two are *fa'ūlun*, occurring alternately. Its normal form is

— ٠ — ٠ | ٠ — ٠ | — — — | ٠ — ٠ || — ٠ — ٠ | ٠ — ٠ | — — — | ٠ — ٠

The length of the line gives the poet an opportunity of developing his thought, for Arabs are careful to have a complete idea in every line. This is probably the reason why every poet sang in this metre. The blind poet Baššār has the following beautiful line:<sup>12</sup>

إِذَا أَنْتَ لَمْ تَشْرَبْ مِرَارًا عَلَى الْقَدَى  
ظَمِئْتَ وَآىَّ النَّاسِ تَصْفُو مَشَارِبُهُ

‘If turbid drinks you never tasted, thirst you did endure,  
For on our earth no man exists whose drinks are always  
pure.’

In this form the minimum number of short syllables in each hemistich is five, and it is therefore no wonder that it is extremely rare in Hebrew. Judah ha-Levi has the following piyyūt:<sup>13</sup>

גִּלְיָי וְבִילִי רָאִי הַדְרֵךְ וְנִבְעֵתוֹ  
וְנִלְיִ תְּהוֹם שְׁחֵקוֹ בְּצִאֲתוֹ וְנִצְמֵתוֹ  
וְאִיךְ תַּעֲמִדְנָה הַנִּפְשׁוֹת בְּסוֹדְךָ  
מִקֹּם אֵשׁ מְלֻחָטָה סְלָעִים וְנִצְתָּה

It should be noticed here that whenever the choice lay between a long and a short syllable, the former was invariably employed by the Hebrew poet.

(b) Sometimes the Arabian poets made the fourth foot identical in form with the second, especially in the rhyme-bearing hemistich. This is necessary when a *ridf* ‘that which rides behind’, is introduced.<sup>14</sup> Its form is then

<sup>12</sup> *Kitābu-l-Aḡānī*, III, p. 28, l. 7.

<sup>13</sup> Harkavy's ed., II, p. 98.

<sup>14</sup> This is a technical name given to one of the letters of prolongation נ, ו, י, when it immediately precedes the *rawī*, or unchangeable part of the rhyme. See Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, II, p. 353.

--- u | u - u | --- u | u - u || --- u | u - u | --- u | u - u

Mustim b. al-Walīd has the following line:<sup>15</sup>

וְסַחֲרֵהָ אֶלְעִינִינִי מַא תְּחַסֵּן אֶלְסַחֲרָ  
תּוֹאֲלִינִי סִרָא וְתַקְטְעֵנִי גֵהֶרָ

‘She of bewitching eyes, unskilled in the enchanter’s art,  
She clings to me in private, openly keeps me apart.’

This mode, reducing the number of short syllables to four, is more frequently met with in Hebrew, and almost every poet of note attempted it. Ha-Nagid has several short poems in this metre:<sup>16</sup>

לְבָנָה אֲשֶׁר נִבְרָאתָ בְּאֶרֶץ לְמִמְשָׁלָה  
בְּיוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה עַל לְבָבוֹת לְאֵט מִשְׁלִי  
בְּמָה תִשְׁפָּטִי בּוֹכָב בָּאֶח לִי חֲשַׁבְתִּיהוּ  
וְנִהַפֶּה בְּלִי פֶשַׁע כְּרָנֵע לְאֶכּוֹר לִי

One at once notices in לְבָנָה, Arabic *badr* ‘full moon’, which is always used figuratively of a beautiful woman.

Ibn Gabirol has the following poem which is abounding in Arabic expressions and colouring:<sup>17</sup>

יְדִידִי שָׁעוּ מִנִּי אֶמְרָר בְּבִכְיָתִי  
וְאוֹלִי שָׁבִיב לְבִי אֶכְבֶּה בְּדִמְעָתִי

Ibn Gabirol’s addressing himself to his friends reminds us of *ḥalilayyā*, with which many Arabic poets begin their love poems. The description of a sleepless night (line 3 ff.) is also borrowed from the Arabs.<sup>18</sup> I suspect that מְהוּמָתִי in line 5 b has a different meaning from what it has in the Bible. *My tumult* or *confusion* hardly suits the context.

<sup>15</sup> *Diwān*, ed. De Goeje, p. 37.

<sup>16</sup> Harkavy’s ed., p. 8.

<sup>17</sup> Dukes, p. 46; Brody, p. 26.

<sup>18</sup> Cp. below, p. 200.



It is not unlikely that the poet intended this word to stand for Arabic *humūm* 'cares'. The cooing dove (line 6) is also a favourite theme with the Arabs. Read חַנְּנִי in line 8a, for there is no sense in saying, *my life and my security is in my soul which I love*. A glaring Arabism is וְלֵאלֹהִים in line 10 a. It represents *walillāhi*, which is often met with in such expressions as *lillāhi anta* 'How admirable are you!'. When an Arab quotes a pithy saying he usually introduces it by *walillāhi man ḵāla* or *walillāhi darru man ḵāla* 'How admirable is he who says!'. The line in question ought to be rendered, 'How admirable are my friends, my beloved!', &c., reading חַנְּנִי. Brody, who misses this point, vocalizes וְלֵאלֹהִים in vain, which is against the tenor of the poem. The picture of the beloved departing on camels (line 11 ff.) is to be found in many *ḵaṣīdas*. Compare especially the Mu'allaka of 'Amr b. Kulthūm: <sup>19</sup>

تَذَكَّرْتُ الصَّبَا وَاشْتَقْتُ لَمَّا  
رَأَيْتُ حُمُولَهَا أَصْلًا حُدَيْنَا

'I recalled youth's love and yearned for days gone by,  
When at eventide I saw their camels hie.'

For line 15, בְּכָל מַחֲנֶה וְנִשְׁקָם, compare the words of Tauba b. Ḥumayyir: <sup>20</sup>

سَقَاكَ مِنَ الْعَرِ الْعَوَادِي مَطِيرُهَا

'May the rain from the pure morning clouds give you to drink!'

The famous poem, יִפְתָּה נֹרָא מִשֵּׁשׁ תִּבְלָה, by Judah ha-Levi, is also in this metre, although all editors without exception

<sup>19</sup> Lyall, *Ten Ancient Arabic Poems*, p. 111, l. 15.

<sup>20</sup> Nöldeke, *Delectus*, p. 5, l. 8.

failed to recognize it, and hence many corruptions arose. Harkavy,<sup>21</sup> in addition to the printed errors, suggests a few more which would conceal the real metre beyond recognition. Brody thinks that its metre is

---o-----o---|---o-----o---

that is to say, a variation of Basīṭ. The objection to this scansion is obvious, for the poem begins with a *šwā mobile*. In his notes<sup>22</sup> Brody meets this objection with the assertion that the prefixed *šwās* are not to be counted. As I remarked above,<sup>23</sup> no *mustaf'ilun* can have more than four syllables. In Brody's edition there are in five lines thirteen superfluous *šwās* occurring at the beginning of words, and can by no stretch of imagination be taken as quiescent ones. Now in order to make this poem agree with this mode of Tawīl seven more *šwās* are required. A proper analysis of each line individually will at once show that these *šwās* were there originally, but were lost through the failure of editors and copyists to recognize the metre. It is a significant fact that all the acrostic-bearing words are quite in order, and have moving *šwās*. It is only some of the other words which had no 'fence' to protect them that suffered corruption. Now out of the seven moving *šwās* that have to be restored, two can be obtained by altering the vocalization. Read קָרִיָּה (line 1a), deriving it from הַקְרִיָּוֹת (Jer. 48. 28) and לָךְ (line 1b), referring it to יָפֶה נוֹף, which is masculine. In line 4b we should read וְשָׁרָךְ, thus preparing for the climax וְנִים. Editors have sometimes found it necessary to offer such anomalous punctuations as קָנָפִי in line 3a; but I think that originally it was קָנָף הַנְּשָׂרִים (cp. קָנָף רְנָנִים, Job 39. 13). Copyists probably

<sup>21</sup> Notes, I, p. 170.

<sup>22</sup> II, p. 122.

<sup>23</sup> p. 165.

considered it their duty to emend it in accordance with the familiar expression occurring in the Bible. Such biblical reminiscences are to be found very frequently in editions in which the metre is disregarded. My suggestion is rendered more certain by the fact that variant readings of this word are recorded by editors. It has been my observation that the majority of corruptions arose under such circumstances. Whenever the poet for exigences of metre was compelled to deviate from familiar phrases, the copyists were ready to correct the error. **בִּי** in line 2 a should be read **בְּעֵת** or **בְּאִשֶּׁר**. Here again the copyist knew of Ps. 77. 12. Similarly **אֵין בָּךְ מְלִכָּךְ** (line 4 a) is a reminiscence of Jer. 8. 19, and the poet probably wrote **אֵין בָּךְ מְלִכִּי**.<sup>24</sup> For **מִפֶּאֱתִי** read **מֵאֵד מִפֶּאֱתִי**. Here again editors record variations. The whole poem should run as follows:

יִפְהַ נֹּחַ מְשֹׁשׁ תִּבֵּל קָרִיָּה לְמִלְכָּךְ רֵב  
 לָךְ נִכְסְפָה נִפְשִׁי מֵאֵד מִפֶּאֱתִי מֵעֵרֵב  
 הַמִּזֶּן בְּחֵמִי נִכְמֹר בְּעֵת אֲזַכְּרָה קֶדֶם  
 בְּבוֹרְךָ אֲשֶׁר גָּלָה וְגוֹף אֲשֶׁר חָרַב  
 וְכִי יִחַנְנִי עַל כִּנֶּף הַנְּשָׁרִים עַד  
 אֲרִנָּה בְּרַמְעֵתִי עֲפָרְךָ וַיִּתְעַרֵּב  
 דְּרִשְׁתִּיךָ וְאֵם אֵין בָּךְ מְלִכִּיךָ וְאֵם בְּמָקוֹם  
 צָרִי גִלְעָדָה נָחַשׁ וְשָׂרָף וְגַם עֲקָרָה  
 חֲלָא אֵת אֲבִיךָ אֲחִיךָ וְאִשְׁתְּךָ  
 וְטַעַם רִנְבִּיךָ לִפִּי מִדְּבַשׁ יַעֲרֵב

It should be observed that in line 3 a **עַד** will be better understood when we know that it has the meaning of Arabic *hattā* with the subjunctive=‘in order that’.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Cp. **אֲשִׁרֶיךָ**, Eccles. 11. 17.

<sup>25</sup> See Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, II, p. 29.

Those who object to this mode of treating the text should bear in mind that a careful study of this poem will convince any one that a regular metre was intended by the poet, and this is the only one possible.

For another probable variation of Ṭawīl, see below, p. 183.

## 2. Basīt, *outspread*.

(a) This is also a compound metre which may be regarded as a companion to Ṭawīl. The number of its syllables is the same as that of the latter. It is composed of *mustaf'ilun* and *fā'ilun*, occurring alternately, and its normal form is

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — — || — — — | — — — | — — — | — — —

The following line is attributed to Abū Adhīna.<sup>26</sup>

مَا كُلُّ يَوْمٍ يَنَالُ الْمَرْءُ مَا طَلَبَا  
وَمَا يُسَوِّغُهُ الْقَدَرُ مَا وَهَبَا

'A man attains not ev'ry day his quest,  
Nor's he allowed with fate's gift to be blest.'

The minimum number of short syllables is four in each hemistich, and this excludes its becoming a favourite with the Hebrew poets. Nevertheless almost every poet attempted to master it. Ha-Nagid has the following poem which has been transmitted in a very corrupt form. The metre is, however, quite evident: <sup>27</sup>

פִּפְיָהּ אֲבִירִי יַעֲקֹב נִפְשִׁי לָךְ צִעֲקָה  
בְּבִכִּי וְכִמְעַם עָלִי כֹס יִשְׁעֶךָ צִחֲקָה

<sup>26</sup> Abul Feda, *Historia anteislamica*, ed. Fleischer, p. 124, l. 8.

<sup>27</sup> Harkavy's ed., p. 107.

Ha-Levi has the following piyyūt: <sup>28</sup>

יִפִּית יְחִידָה בְּעוֹדָהּ בִּי וְנִעְמָתָּ לִי  
הַיּוֹם בְּעִמְדָהּ פָּנִי אֲדוֹן שְׁמוֹ גּוֹאֲלִי

It should be observed that the *šwa* quiescent of וְנִעְמָתָּ is regarded here as *mobile*.

(b) Arabian poets allow the rhyme-bearing *fā'ilun* to be reduced to a spondee. This is necessitated by the introduction of a *ridf*.<sup>29</sup> Ḥassān b. Thābit has a lyrical poem in this metre: <sup>30</sup>

وَالْمَالُ يَغْشَىٰ أَنَاسًا لَا طَبَاحَ بِهِمْ  
كَالَسَمِيلِ يَغْشَىٰ أُصُولَ الدِّينِ الدَّيَالِي

'And wealth doth overwhelm those men who are not staid,  
As sweeps away a flood the stems that are decayed.'

In this form the metre is more frequently met with in Hebrew. Abraham Ibn Ezra has the following lines: <sup>31</sup>

גִּבֹּר אֲנָשִׁיךְ דָּת וְזֶקֶן חֲרַת עָלַי לְבוֹ  
יִשְׁמַח בְּדַעְתּוֹ כְּנִבּוֹר עֵת שְׁלוֹף חֲרָבוֹ  
לְחֶקֶר יִסּוֹד סוֹד צִפְנֵתוֹ יַעֲלֶה אֶל מַעוֹן  
מִדָּעַ וַיִּשְׁקִיף בְּעֵינָיו שֶׁכֶּל בְּאַשְׁנָבוֹ

Ha-Levi's panegyric to Solomon b. Farōṣāl is in this metre: <sup>32</sup>

בַּעֲלַת בְּשָׁפִים אֲשֶׁר אָרְכּוּ נְדוּדֶיהָ  
יָמִים וְקִצְרוֹ יָמֵי חַיֵּי יְדִידֶיהָ  
יָפָה בְּשִׁמְשׁ אֶבֶל לֹא פָנְתָה לְעֶרֶב  
לְחֶיָּה עֲרוּגָה וְלֹא כָלוּ נְרָדֶיהָ

<sup>28</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 141.

<sup>29</sup> See above, p. 166.

<sup>30</sup> *Dīwān*, ed. Hirschfeld, p. 69, no. 159, l. 7.

<sup>31</sup> Egers's ed., p. 10.

<sup>32</sup> Brody, I, p. 14.

Like most of the poems of this class, the present one is full of Arabic colouring and imagery. It is true that *בַּעֲלַת בְּשָׁפִים* occurs in Nahum 3. 4, but the sense required here is not quite identical with that of the Bible. Here it is an enchantress of a different kind, and reminds us of the Arabic *sahir(un)*. Then *נִדְרִים* does not mean *wandering* in the biblical sense, but corresponds to Arabic *hajr(un)* or *hijrān(un)* 'departure, separation'. This is the signification of this word in the majority of cases in mediaeval Hebrew poetry, where it is not the *נִדָּר* who suffers, but the one left behind. The first verse of our poem is to be found, in one form or another, in almost every Arabic *Dīwān*. Muslim b. al-Walīd says: <sup>33</sup>

هَجْرَانَهَا قَرِيبٌ وَوَصْلَهَا بَعِيدٌ

'Her absence is near, and her company is far,' that is to say, her separation lasts longer than her friendship.

Line 2 a is almost a literal translation of another verse by Muslim b. al-Walīd. A lady vaunting her beauty says: <sup>34</sup>

أَنَا الشَّمْسُ الْمُضِيئَةُ حِينَ تَبْدُو  
وَلَكِنْ لَسْتُ أَعْرَفُ بِالْمَغِيبِ

'I'm the illuminating sun when it doth shine,  
But I am never known to set or decline.'

The same lady says: <sup>35</sup>

وَلَسْتُ أُرِيدُ طِيبًا غَيْرَ طِيبِي

'I desire no perfume but my own,'

and this explains line 2 b.

<sup>33</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 155, l. 11.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 153, l. 8.

<sup>35</sup> *l. c.*, l. 11 b.

Brody<sup>36</sup> has rightly pointed out that lines 7, 8 are extremely difficult. The expression נפשי פדות is quite familiar in Hebrew as well as in Arabic from which it is borrowed, and calls for no special explanation. But I think if we try to get the Arabic expressions which these lines represent, we may obtain a satisfactory solution. One often meets some such sentence as *nafsī fidā leilin yufakku bihi asīruki* 'I would offer my soul as a ransom for the night in which your prisoner is released'. Now when Arabian poets talk of releasing this kind of prisoner their expressions may be interpreted in two ways:

(1) The poet wishes to become indifferent to the object of his affection, that is to say, his desire is to be freed from her bewitching influence. We often hear the disappointed lover arguing logically with his captivator: 'Either requite me with your love, or give me back my heart of which you deprived me.' And cruel Venus mockingly replies: 'neither of your requests will be granted.'

(2) On other occasions the poet in asking for freedom wishes to have his desire gratified. That our poet here intends to convey the latter meaning is quite evident from the following lines in which love's revelry is artistically described. The greatest difficulty lies in line 7 b:

רק הארמה בחבל מחמדים

To my mind חבל has been misunderstood. It does not denote *region* or *district*, but *rope*, and together with מחמדים represents Arabic *hablu-l-hawā* 'the rope of love', which one meets so often. Ibn Gabirol translates this phrase by חבלי האהבים,<sup>37</sup> which renders my suggestion more certain,

<sup>36</sup> Notes, p. 26.

<sup>37</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 42, no. 30, l. 9 a.

since the Hebrew poets used all these synonyms. הַאֲדָמָה is very likely a metaphor for *body*, which in prose would be הָמָר. The hemistich should accordingly be rendered: *Only the body is in the rope of her love*. The poet thus explains what kind of freedom he is asking for. Let the soul alone be free from anxiety, but the body should still be enslaved by her love. He then goes on depicting the riotous revelry for which he is longing:

שָׁתָה וּמָצָה שִׁפְתַּי אֶדָם וְרוּחַת בְּצִיּוֹף  
פִּיהָ מְגִדִּי וְפִי הַבּוֹס מְגִדִּיהָ

This verse has also been misunderstood. Brody<sup>38</sup> remarks החֲרוּזִים הָאֵלֶּה קָשִׁי הֵבֵנָה הֵם . . . וְאוּלַּי יֵשׁ לְפָרֵשׁ רוּחוֹת. בצוף פיה שהוא מגד, בעוד אשר פי הוא מגד. Let the reader try to construe this verse, and see how far the difficulty is solved. It seems to me that מְגִדִּים is here used metaphorically for *lips*. It should be noted that in the Bible this word has no fixed meaning. There is no doubt that it is identical with Arabic *majd(un)* 'honour, glory', and very likely has the signification of *choice, excellence*. The transition to the metaphor is, therefore, not very far. וְפִי (line 8 b) is not construct state, depending on הַבּוֹס, but is with pronominal suffix 1st person singular. The line should be translated:

'To quaff and drain her rosy lips, and sate  
My mouth and lips with her mouth's honeycomb—  
Her lips will serve as cup!'

In the note quoted above, Brody proceeds: והיה מנהגם: להלל את אהובת נפשם גם בזה שחיא יודעת להריק כוס לתוך פיה וכמ"ש רי"ה (ס' צ"ג צד 136) פי כוס בפי עפר צפה. Here again

<sup>38</sup> I, notes, p. 26.



Brody misses the point. His note to the latter poem runs : <sup>39</sup>

פִּי כּוֹס בְּפִי עֶפְרָיִם

יֵינִי וּמִגְדּוֹ פֶּה אֶל פֶּה

שא נא עיניך וראה את עפרי ובפיהו פי הכוס וה' דומה כאלו נשקו חר  
(את אחד ייני(הרוק אשר בפי עפרי) ומגדו(של עפרי והוא היין אשר בכוס).  
I wonder whether the reader could follow this description.  
In this case also פִּי = *my mouth*, and the verse should be  
rendered :

‘ Watch my mouth is a cup in an antelope’s mouth,  
My wine and his lip,—mouth to mouth !’

What a beautiful metaphor, and how befogged and mutilated it emerges from a faulty construing! Those who are acquainted with the figurative expressions of the Arabs will, I hope, have no objection to my explanation. An Arab says ‘the swimmer’ (*sābiḥ*) and means the camel which is the ship of the desert. He says ‘the fettered’ (*muḥayyad*) and means the foot. Ha-Levi himself speaks of apples and means the breasts.<sup>40</sup> Sometimes Hebrew poets say pomegranates instead of apples.<sup>41</sup> Of course this metaphor is also borrowed from the Arabs. Muslim b. al-Walīd says : <sup>42</sup>

زَرَعَ الشَّبَابُ لَهُنَّ رُמَانَ الصِّبَا

فِي أَنْحُرٍ قَدْ زُيِّنَتْ بِتَرَائِبِ

‘ Love’s pomegranates did youth plant  
Upon their chests, adorned with bones.’

<sup>39</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 223.

<sup>40</sup> See *op. cit.*, II, p. 18, and still more explicit II, p. 6.

<sup>41</sup> Moses ibn Ezra, *Taršīš*, p. 36, no. 106, and also ha-Levi, I, p. 100.

<sup>42</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 149, l. 30.

Ya'qob b. El'azar has the metaphor of the cup and lip in more explicit terms:<sup>43</sup>

מִי יִתְּנָה כּוֹסֵי שְׁפֹת רַעִיָּה  
בִּי מִתְּנָה מִכָּל בְּלִי הַשְׁקוֹת

To return to our poem. In line 17 a, both Brody and Harkavy punctuate כִּבְּה which is impossible, since this word is intransitive in Hebrew, and it certainly cannot be taken as predicate to יְקוּרֶיהָ which is plural. It is therefore necessary to vocalize כִּבְּהָ. This expression can only be properly understood with the help of Arabic. In the Bible the extinction of one's light is supposed to be a curse, as is plainly seen from Prov. 20. 20; Job 18. 4, and a few more passages. But the expression in this poem represents Arabic *aḥmada nīrānaha* or *atfa'a nīrānaha* 'he quenched her flames'. The woe-begone lover often complains *fī fu'ādī nār(un) leisa laha ḥumūd(un)* 'within my heart there is a flame which does not abate', or 'is not extinguished'. When his hope is realized he may say *uḥmida-n-nar(u)* or *utfi'a-n-nār(u)*. The expression of Canticles 8. 7 is not to the point here, for in that verse there is no reference to the realization of love's hope.

In this metre is also ha-Levi's famous poem:<sup>44</sup>

עֵינַי הִלָּא תִשְׁאַלֵּי לְשָׁלוֹם אֲסִירֶיהָ  
דְּזֻרְשֵׁי שְׁלוֹמָהּ וְהֵם יִתֵּר עֲדָרֶיהָ  
מִיָּם וּמִזֶּרֶחַ וּמִצָּפוֹן וְתִמֹן שְׁלוֹם  
רְחוֹק וְקָרֹב שְׂאֵי מִכָּל עֲבָרֶיהָ

Al-Ḥarizi evidently had this poem in mind when he

<sup>43</sup> Brody and Albrecht, *Ša'ar ha-Šir*, p. 163.

<sup>44</sup> Brody's ed., II, p. 155.

wrote the following lines which have the same metre and approximately the same rhyme : <sup>45</sup>

קָבֵר נְבִיא הָאֻמָּת אֲשֶׁרִּיו וְאֲשֶׁרִּיד  
 שָׁלוֹם בְּחִילָהּ וְשָׁלוֹם מִעֲבָרֶיהָ  
 אֵתָהּ כְּנוּף רַק יִחְזָקָאֵל הוּא לְבַד נִפְשָׁךְ  
 אוֹ אֵת כְּשֶׁחַק וְכֵן בּוֹנֵי מְאוּרֶיהָ

(c) But even in this form several short syllables are necessary for each line. Hence a further step was taken. On analogy of the rhyme-bearing anapaest, all anapaests were reduced to spondees, and the following variation of Basit̄ was the result :

-- | - ˘ -- | -- | - ˘ -- || -- | - ˘ -- | -- | - ˘ --

As only four short syllables are to be employed in a line of eight feet, the Arabian poets could not very well compose their poems in this metre, and writers do not classify it among the proper metres. In Hebrew, however, it could be employed with advantage. Moses Ibn Ezra in his *Taršīš* has the following lines : <sup>46</sup>

כָּל אִם עָלִי חֶבֶל תִּאָּחַב הָיִיתָ לָּהּ צִיִּן  
 לְבִיט לְמִפְּתָה עוֹ פֶּרַח וְהוֹצִיא צִיִּן

The following poem by Ibn Gabirol is in this metre : <sup>47</sup>

וְכֵן שְׁתוּלָהּ עַל מִים וּפּוֹרֶיָהּ  
 הָאֵת צְבִיָּה אוֹ עֲנָלָה יִפְיָפִיָּה  
 בְּרָאוֹת אֶנּוּשׁ חֵי מֵת תִּאָּחַף שְׁחוֹק וּבְכִי  
 וּבִטָּל עָלִי שׁוֹשֵׁן דִּמְעָה עָלִי לְחִיָּה

<sup>45</sup> *Tahkemōnī*, p. 140.

<sup>46</sup> p. 24.

<sup>47</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 35. See also Geiger, *Salomo Gabirol*, pp. 67, 134.

In Dukes' edition the metre is in some places not clear. But one can in most cases restore the text without difficulty. In the above lines על had to be changed into עָלַי and the hemistichs differently divided. In הִתְאַסַּף (line 2 a) I recognize an Arabism. It does not signify *gather*, but *combine* like Arabic *jama'a*. The whole line should be rendered: *When seeing a living-dead man she combines mirth and weeping, and like dew upon a rose is a tear upon her cheek*. For the rest of the poem a few more emendations are necessary to make it agree with the metre and yield good sense. In line 4 a delete ל of לְהַטּוֹת. The preceding word חַמָּה can scarcely be right. Perhaps some such word as תִּרְצָה should be read. Delete ו of וַיָּמוּת (line 5 b). In line 6 delete ו of וְנוֹחַר and וּמִבֵּין. In line 7 b ו of וַאֲרִיר should be deleted. Either punctuate שׁוֹכְנֵת or read שׁוֹכְנָה in line 9 a. Vocalize וַיַּפְּיָה (line 10 b), not as in the text. In line 13 a read חֲכָמִי instead of חֲכָמִי, and in the second hemistich point שְׂבִיָּה, not שְׂבִיָּה. The end of line 14 is obviously corrupt, but the scansion is quite correct. וַאֲתַחֲיָה should perhaps be divided into חַיָּה וַאֲתָ. But the whole line is doubtful.<sup>48</sup> *If men were divided they would form two companies with two souls, but you are the moving spirit of both* is too much circumlocution for *you are the moving spirit of mankind*. In line 15 פְּתִיּוֹת is against grammar. פְּתִי (abstract noun, as in Prov. 1. 22) probably was the original reading which was afterwards substituted by the more usual word. Sense and metre demand the reading אֶתְּ כִּכְפֹּי instead of the vague כַּסּוֹת בְּאֵל (line 15 b). The ל of לִקַּח (line 17 a) should be deleted, for the imperative is obviously intended. In line 18 a, ו of וַאֲלֹם should be deleted.

<sup>48</sup> See, however, Geiger, p. 134.

To the same metre belongs ha-Levi's panegyric addressed to Moses Ibn Ezra:<sup>49</sup>

תָּן רִיתְךָ בְּשִׁמִּי מִפָּאֵת בְּלִיל יָפִי  
מָרָם וְמִן יִמְסָה בְּנִדּוּד שֶׁאֵר גּוֹפִי

I have advisedly omitted to punctuate שֶׁאֵר. All editions take it to be שְׁאֵר *the rest*; but I am not sure whether שְׁאֵר *flesh* would not suit the context better. The assigning of the metre of this poem, it should be observed, is open to dispute. Brody thinks the metre is

— — — — — | — — — — —

This metre is quite unknown, and I do not think there is sufficient ground for making this poem an exception, and the insertion of the short syllable is scarcely justifiable. This poem consists of twenty lines, thirteen out of which have *šwās*, moving and resting, in the middle of words, and whichever way we scan the lines grammatical rules are violated. The real objection to my method of scansion is the fact that five lines contain *šwās* at the beginning of words. But this objection is only apparent. In line 3 read לְתַמּוּל instead of עַל תַּמּוּל (cp. Jer. 22. 10). In line 6 delete ו of וְשִׁם. Editors have found great difficulty in line 7. Some manuscripts have בְּעַר which cannot be made to fit the supposed metre. Brody has a long note on this line, but all the explanations he quotes are admittedly inadequate. The difficulty is, however, only created by editors who are compelled to read בְּעַר to get an extra short syllable, and I think the proper reading is

לֵיל שְׁעָרֵי מַכְסָּה בְּעַר פְּנֵי צוֹפִי

*The night of his hair* (i. e. his black hair) *covers him*

<sup>49</sup> Brody's ed., I. p. 122.

from my eye (lit. *is a covering for my eye*). For the metaphorical use of צֹפֶה cp. הָרֹאֶה (Eccles. 12. 3). Brody reads בְּעֵרִי פָנַי צֹפֶה, and tacitly admits that it is difficult. All kinds of fanciful explanations were suggested for צֹפֶה. The way I vocalize it we have in בְּעֵר an instance of — ט — ט. In line 8 read אֶטְבֵּעַ instead of אֶטְבָּעָה. In line 10 read דִּוֵּר instead of יָרִיר. Line 12 has again caused difficulty. Harkavy has וְעָלִי, which is against either way of scanning. It has therefore been suggested to read וְעָלִי, and numerous suggestions were offered, all of which are, to say the least, far-fetched. But the simplest thing is to read עָלִי, and this clause should be rendered: *About him are the choice words of my mouth*. Another obscure line is 13. If יַצֵּר be correct, the only possible vocalization is יַצֵּר *will be hostile*, or *vex* (cp. Isa. 11. 13). Harkavy's יַצֵּר is certainly unintelligible, and Brody's יַצֵּר is inadequate, for this word denotes *will be in straits*. Whichever way we take יַצֵּר the ל of לָבֵל is indispensable. I therefore think that we should delete בָּל, and translate the line: *If Time is hostile I shall take refuge in his company*. According to this conception אִנּוּ in the following line will have to be emended to אִנּוּ. If, however, the conception of this line as given by commentators is right, the best reading would be

אִנּוּ הַזְמַן יַעֲצֵר מִהְיוֹת בְּחֶבְרָתוֹ

In line 15 וַפָּצַר seems to have a meaning slightly different from that in the Bible. For it evidently signifies here *persist*, and it is not unlikely that the mediaeval writers were influenced by Arabic *aṣarra* 'he persisted, persevered'. Instead of דָּמִי, which is a biblical reminiscence, read דָּם.

The two Arabic lines at the end of this poem have been

slightly misunderstood by Harkavy and Brody. The former translates הל by האין and the latter by הלא. Now in Arabic *hal* introduces an open question, so that both renderings are inaccurate. Brody is nearer the right meaning of the second line, which Harkavy renders very vaguely. The proper reading, however, is that of Geiger: הל = *he dwelled*. The lines are to be translated:

‘Ye at the van of knowledge, glory, and high rank,  
Turn to the rear when Mūsā dwelleth in your midst.’

The poet has skilfully used the two antitheses *ḵāid* ‘a leader’ and *ḵalf(un)* ‘rear’. *Halla* may be conditional; but we may also render: *for Mūsā dwelleth, &c.*

As these lines stand they agree with neither method of scansion. But in few poems do the Arabic lines agree with the metre. This is certainly due to the fact that many of the copyists knew no Arabic, and paid no attention to the scansion of the lines, and hence many corruptions arose. These lines, however, are straightforward, and the first one is an ordinary Basīṭ, and this makes my scansion more probable. In the second line we should have to alter the arrangement of the words to make it fit the ordinary Basīṭ. But the following reading which involves insignificant changes may be suggested to make the lines agree with the metre of the rest of the poem:

יֵא קֹדֶרֶה אֶלְעֵלֶם אֶלְגִּלְאֵל וְאֶלְשֶׁרֶף  
חֵל בְּנֵם מוֹסִי פֶאֶרְגֶּע אֵלִי כֵלֶף

The singular פֶאֶרְגֶּע would refer to each one separately.

It should be noted here that Sa'adyā b. Dannān<sup>50</sup> gives this metre as the third Ṭawīl. In this case we have to assume that *fa'ūlun* became a spondee, which is at first

<sup>50</sup> *Meleket ha-Šūr*, p. 11.

sight hardly possible. The Arabs allow in Tawīl to drop the first short syllable only. This is sometimes the case at the beginning of the first line of the poem. For then the audience may not notice the omission, and the rhythmic beat is not thereby disturbed. In the middle of the line, however, it is inadmissible. Some writers on prosody record rare exceptions where later poets allow themselves to drop the short syllable at the beginning of a hemistich in the middle of a poem. But I think in these cases a new poem was intended. For those who arranged the Dīwāns sometimes made two separate poems run into one, when both had the same rhyme and metre. Rosin<sup>51</sup> follows Sa'adyā, and observes that Freytag (p. 170) supports this rule. But Freytag does nothing of the kind. He explicitly states that only at the beginning of the hemistich is one allowed to omit the short syllable. However, Sa'adyā may not be altogether wrong. There are a few poems apparently in this metre which have caused some difficulty, as some of the supposed *mustaf'ilun* feet are prefixed by *šwā mobile*. Brody asserts that this is permissible, but I have sufficiently explained above that this view is untenable. At first sight one is inclined to resort to emendations, and it is my opinion that if emendations are justified in any field, mediaeval Hebrew poetry should come in for a large share. In some cases this may be effected with more success. But there are many poems in which these unnecessary *šwās* are present, and no emendations are justified. Moreover, it is remarkable that this peculiarity of having a superfluous *šwā* seldom occurs in Kāmil or Wāfir, but is usually present in this kind of metre. I am therefore inclined to believe that the Hebrew poets proceeded, without justification, of

<sup>51</sup> *Reime und Gedichte*, p. 8.



course, to reduce the *fa'ūlun* foot to a spondee, or better still, to make the first syllable of *fa'ūlun* optional. The scansion would then be

---υ|--(υ)|---υ|--(υ)||---υ|--(υ)|---υ|--(υ)

When no short syllable occurred at all this secondary Ṭawīl coincided with the secondary Basīṭ, and this accounts for Sa'adyā's opinion. But since there is more justification for reducing *fa'ūlun* to a spondee, I prefer to assign all poems which have no superfluous syllables to the Basīṭ metre. Those, however, in which superfluous syllables occur must be regarded as belonging to a secondary Ṭawīl. Ibn Gabirol's following poem is in this metre: <sup>52</sup>

מִי זֹאת בָּמוֹ שְׁחַר עוֹלָה וְנִשְׁקָפָה

תֹּאִיר בְּאוֹר חֲמֹה בְּרָה מְאֹד יָפָה

בְּבוֹדָה בְּבֵת מְלֶךְ עֲדִינָה מְעֻנָּה

רֵיחַ בְּרִיחַ מְקַטֵּר מֵר וּבִשְׁרָפָה.

For obvious reasons I cannot assign the poems יָפָה נוֹף (above p. 170) and נֶפֶן שְׁתוּלָה (above p. 178) to this metre. The former, as was shown above, can by proper analysis be made to be a regular Ṭawīl, and in the latter many of the emendations are necessitated by the context independently of scansion.

### 3. Kāmil, *perfect*.

This metre is composed of *Epitritus tertius* repeated three times in each hemistich. For the first syllable of every foot two short ones may be substituted, which are regarded as equal to a long one, and it is from this circumstance that its name is derived. For it has more compulsory long syllables than any other metre with the exception of

<sup>52</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 40; *Ša'ar ha-Šir*, p. 38.

Wāfir, which is its companion. It is of very frequent occurrence in Arabic, and has several well-established variations. Hebrew poets could handle it with great facility, as the number of compulsory short syllables does not exceed three in a hemistich containing nine long syllables, and it is therefore no wonder that one meets it very frequently. Jewish writers on prosody, however, have confused it with Rajaz, and Kāmil is entirely excluded. Sa'adyā b. Dannān also takes all the Hebrew poems in Kāmil as Rajaz, and 'invents' a new combination which he imagines to be Kāmil.<sup>53</sup> The reason of this misunderstanding is not far to seek. In Arabic the Kāmil is at once recognized by the peculiarity referred to above. But in Hebrew it is impossible to have two moving *šwās* in succession, and hence *mustaf'ilun* and *mutafā'ilun* coincide. A light vowel with its *šwā mobile*, which very likely represents ֿֿ was taken as —. But a careful study of Arabic prosody will prove beyond doubt that the view to exclude Kāmil and make Rajaz occur often is untenable. The latter metre in Arabic is mostly of two feet, and allows of so many variations in each foot that many writers on prosody deny it the rank of a developed metre. It is no doubt the connecting-link between the rhymed prose known as *saġ* and the metres which were developed later on. Its close affinity with rhymed prose is quite evident from the fact that one and the same poem may have hemistichs of two and three feet. Altogether it is to be employed for extempore poetry. Whenever I read a poem in Rajaz I have the same impression as when reading the short Qur'ānic outbursts. Ample illustration of the above remarks will be found later on when Rajaz will be treated of. On the

<sup>53</sup> See above, p. 154.

other hand, Kāmil is a metre of full dignity, and is a favourite with all Arabian poets. Two of the Mu'allakāt—those of Labīd and 'Antara—are written in it. It is, therefore, quite impossible that the Hebrew poets should adopt Rajaz, and leave Kāmil out. Furthermore, there are metres of this type which have no equivalent in Rajaz, but are well-known forms of Kāmil.<sup>54</sup>

(a) Its normal form is

— u — uu | — u — uu | — u — uu || — u — uu | — u — uu | — u — uu

Labīd's *Mu'allakā* is in this metre : <sup>55</sup>

فَوَقَّعْتُ أَسْأَلَهَا وَكَيْفَ سَوَّالِنَا  
صَمًّا حَوَالِدَ مَا يَبِينُ كَلَامُهَا

'I stood beseeching them, but what avails it to beseech  
Those deaf and stolid things? not to be fathomed is their  
speech!'

Moses Ibn Ezra has the following lines in his *Taršīš*: <sup>56</sup>

עֲפָרָה אֲשֶׁר הָעֵינִן לִפְנֵינוּ כְּמוֹ  
שֶׁחֶר וְנִבְיָא בִּידֵי הָעֵלָה  
וְנִחְנוּהָ סֶהַר חֲצוֹת לַיִל וְאֶת  
כּוֹסוֹ בְּאֵלֵינוּ בִּידֵי הָעֵלָה

This is a favourite picture in Arabic love poems and panegyrics. סֶהַר obviously represents *badr* 'full moon'.

Judah ha-Levi has expressed his belief in the immortality of the Jewish race in this metre : <sup>57</sup>

<sup>54</sup> See below under *d*.

<sup>55</sup> Lyall, *Ten Ancient Arabi Poems*, p. 69, l. 24.

<sup>56</sup> p. 30.

<sup>57</sup> Brody, II, 307.

שָׁמַשׁ וַיֵּרַח לְעוֹלָם שְׁרָתוֹ  
חֲקוֹת בְּיוֹם וְלֵילָה לֹא נִצְמְתוּ  
הֵם נִהְנוּ אוֹתוֹת לְזֶרַע יַעֲקֹב  
לְחַיֹּת לְעוֹלָם גּוֹי וְלֹא יִכְרְתוּ

Ha-Nagid has the following lines: <sup>58</sup>

מִלְכָּה שְׁנוּאָה מִפְּלֹךְ הַתְּאֵתָרִי  
שָׁרָה שְׁנוּאָה עַל מִשְׁנֵאִיף שָׁרִי  
עֲפָרַת שְׁנִיר אֲרָכָה תְּנוּמָתוֹף עָלִי  
עָרֵשׁ חָלִי הַתְּנַעֲרִי הַחֲעוֹרִי

Al-Ḥarizi in his *Mahberet Itiel* says: <sup>59</sup>

שְׁלוֹם בְּבֵית זֶה וְעַל כָּל יוֹשְׁבָיו  
תְּמִיד וְאֵף אֶל יַחֲרֹף כָּל אוֹיְבָיו  
יֵד הָאֶפְלָה שְׁלָחָה לָכֶם יָגוֹשׁ  
נִגְשׁ וְנִנְעָה כִּי כְּנִי יוֹם אוֹרְכָיו

Almost every poet of note attempted this metre. At the same time, to make it more extensively employed, it was advisable to elide a short syllable. The Arabian poets often allow the rhyme-bearing foot to consist of three long syllables. This must be the case when a *ridf*<sup>60</sup> is required.

(b) Its form is then

— — — | — — — | — — — || — — — | — — — | — — —

Muslim b. al-Walīd has his long panegyric addressed to Zeid b. Muslim in this metre: <sup>61</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Harkavy's ed., p. 8.

<sup>59</sup> Chenery's ed., p. 12.

<sup>60</sup> See above, p. 166.

<sup>61</sup> *Diwan*, p. 165, l. 83.

وَأَرَى الْهَوَادِثَ لَا تَزَالُ تَنْوِينِي  
غَرَضًا وَتُقَصِّدُ فِي الْفَوَادِ نِيَالًا

‘I see calamities from me do not depart,  
I am their goal—they aim their arrows at my heart.’

Ha-Levi has the following poem in this metre: <sup>62</sup>

הַעוֹד לַיְלָדוּת נִפְשֵׁךְ נִבְכָּפֶת  
אַחַר אֲשֶׁר הִחְלַבְנָה מַחְלָפֶת  
הַעוֹד יִמְלֵא הַזְמַן פִּיךָ שְׂחֹק  
אַחַר הָיוֹת דְּמַעְתֶּךָ שׁוֹטְפֶת

Like the majority of all other love poems this one contains many Arabisms. To begin with, יְלָדוּת cannot have here the signification it has in the Bible, for the question would not be to the point. When a man is young there is no need for him to long for youth; it is just when he grows aged that he is inspired with yearnings for the days that are no more. Brody in his notes approximately gets the right sense when he remarks that youth with all its pleasures is meant here. But the meaning of the line becomes infinitely clearer when we know that יְלָדוּת here is a translation of Arabic *ṣiba(n)*, which denotes ‘youth’ as well as ‘ardour of youthful love’. The question then becomes forceful: *Do you long for youthful love after your lock grew grey?* מַחְלָפֶת also has a slightly different meaning from what it has in the Bible. It means here ‘forelock’, and represents Arabic *duābat(un)*. One often comes across such an expression as *šamila-l-mašibu-d-dawāiba* ‘hoariness covered the forelocks’.

In Dukes’ edition of Ibn Gabirol’s *Dīwān* (p. 20) there

<sup>62</sup> Brody’s ed., I, p. 129.

is a contemplative poem full of sublime reflections which is in this metre, but owing to its deplorably corrupt state there are many obscure passages which require radical changes in order to yield a suitable meaning and fit the metre. S. D. Luzzatto and Senior Sachs<sup>63</sup> have made attempts to explain some of the difficulties, but have admittedly left a great deal to be desired. Geiger has a free translation, and some notes in his treatise on Ibn Gabirol.<sup>64</sup> My conception of the poem differs fundamentally from that of these scholars:

אֵלֵי דְמַעוֹת בְּחֶרֶי נִדְחוּ  
הַשְׁקוּ לְחֵי עַד אֲשֶׁר צָפְחוּ  
יִתְמָהֶמָּהוּ כִּי יִנְעוּ מְרוֹץ מָעַט  
וּבִשְׂוֹר אֲנַחָה תִרְדָּפֶם יִבְרָחוּ

Even in these four hemistichs some slight changes are necessary. Dukes has אולי, and Luzzatto has emended it to אֵלֵי *drops*. Senior Sachs in *Ozar Hokmah*<sup>65</sup> reads אֵלֵי, but withdrew his suggestion in *Ha-Zophe Le-Ha-Maggid*,<sup>66</sup> because he found in a book of a mediaeval grammarian that אולי here is to be understood in the sense of לולי. This, of course, makes no difference in regard to the sense. As Ibn Gabirol certainly wanted to say *if*, אֵלֵי is better than אולי. For no one would attach any weight to the reading of the manuscript used by Dukes. Instead of יִתְמָהֶמָּהוּ and יִנְעוּ (line 2 a) Dukes has ותמהמהו and נגעו.

The poet declares that he does not weep now. His tears tarry, because they are weary of flowing, and seeing

<sup>63</sup> Professor Israel Davidson kindly supplied me with a list of places where some of Ibn Gabirol's poems were published. The poem in question was commented upon in *Ha-Maggid*, III, pp. 146, 150; *Ha-Zophe le-Ha-Maggid*, VI, pp. 253, 276; *Ozar Hokmah*, II, p. 35.

<sup>64</sup> pp. 45, 122.

<sup>65</sup> II, p. 35.

<sup>66</sup> VI, p. 276.

a sigh which follows them they retreat (*lit.* flee). Had he wept his cheeks would have been saturated with tears, and would have produced sprouts. This exaggerating metaphor occurs in Muslim b. al-Walīd's *Dīwān*:<sup>67</sup>

أَعْشَبَ خَدَّيْ مِنَ الْبَكَاءِ وَقَدْ  
أُزْرَقَ غُصْنُ الْهَوَى عَلَى كَيْدِي

'Upon my cheek from weeping grass did grow  
Luxuriant upon my liver was love's bough.'

The poet's silence, however, must not be taken for a sign that his grief is abated, or that he is unable to weep. He goes on to describe a night which he spent in weeping:

לֵיל נָנְרוּ עֵינַי בְּאֵלוֹ הַדְמִי  
בְּשִׁכְרִי עֲמִידָה בּוֹכְבִּי לְקַחֵהוּ

This, I think, is the right reading instead of עֲמִידָה. The meaning accordingly is: *The night in which my eyes shed tears was such as if the stars were at a standstill* (*lit. took silence*) *like a hireling of standing* (or *waiting*; cp. Arabic *waḳafa*). The description of a sleepless night is a great favourite with Arabian *ḳaṣīda* writers who wish to attract the attention of the audience by recounting their grief. The poet usually complains that the night appeared to be everlasting. When treating of Wāfir I shall quote one or two passages illustrating this figure of speech. The pronominal suffix of בּוֹכְבִּי refers to לֵיל, and not, as Dukes thinks, to עֵינַי, which is feminine plural.

The poet's thoughts now turn to describe the stars:

לֹא תִחַזְמוּ יָרְמוּ מֵאַתְרִי  
מִסֶּף תִּבְלֹת אַתְרִי יָחֹה

<sup>67</sup> No. 64, p. 218, l. 3.

The printed edition has יחזמו, and Dukes rightly remarks that it should be changed into ירזמו. On account of the metre I prefixed יז to אחרי.

תקע לבבי עת בנוסם בן לבל  
יכלו וכמזט קט בנדי לחו

This is a very difficult verse, and many emendations were suggested, none of which can claim any degree of probability. The MS. vocalizes תקע which, I think, is right. The last word of this verse in the text is לקחו which is against the metre, and was emended to קחו. Now this word hardly gives any sense. Luzzatto's reading תקע . . . . בף is ingenious, but does not suit the context. I therefore suggest the reading לָחוּ. It is true that the verb is not biblical, but the same objection applies to קחו.<sup>68</sup> It seems to me that בן, which in the Bible means a *pedestal*, is used here for the peg of the tent. The poet thus describes the departure of his friends. The verse should be translated: *My heart grew sick (lit. was dislocated) when the pedestal was raised, (out of grief) lest they be destroyed, and in a while my clothes grew wet.* This translation is strengthened by the following line: *Had not the morning star made my grief to cease, my neighbours would have swum in tears.* In this line בי is to be deleted as dittography. The following four lines form a digression of a contemplative character which is quite usual in any Arabic *ḡaṣīda*. The sense is straightforward, and all emendations are quite unnecessary, except that in line 9 a ערי is to be read instead of ער on account of the metre. Line 10:

אפנש מידעי באנחותי אשך  
לי פנשו הרים אני נפחו

<sup>68</sup> For ל can only be dropped when it has a *šwā*.



should be compared with the line of Hišām b. 'Uḡba al-Adawī:<sup>69</sup>

نَعَوَّ بِأَسْقِ الْأَفْعَالِ لَا يَخْلُفُونَهُ  
تَكَادُ الْجِبَالُ الصَّمِّ مِنْهُ تَصَدَّعُ

'The death of him whose deeds were noble was announced;  
he left

No peer; the tidings wellnigh caused the mountains to  
be cleft.'

Line 11 contains an Arabism, and hence was misunderstood by the above-mentioned scholars. רצחו represents Arabic *ḡatala* which means besides 'he killed', (1) 'he inspired with vehement love'; (2) 'he tempered wine with water'.

The purport of the line then is *they killed their lover or beloved* (by inspiring him with love) *with a goblet into which they poured wine* (lit. the blood of the brother of 'Aner, i.e. Eškol, a cluster of grapes) *which was not killed*; that is to say, was not mixed with water. He goes on: *Then they breathed into him* (or better read *me*) *the spirit of God, and fanned the flame of my heart with the scent of perfume*. This is, of course, a description of his vehement love. See above, p. 177. But in the midst of his intoxicating ecstasy the poet's heart forebodes evil, and he feels that all is vanity. He asks:

מה־מָצְאוּ קִירוֹת לִבִּי בְּאֵמֶר:  
שׂוּא חֲשָׁקוֹ חֲשָׁק וְטַפֵּל מָחָר

Luzzatto unnecessarily emends מָצְאוּ to מָצְאוּ. The poet then explains the cause of his grief, and says: *For lovers*

<sup>69</sup> *Hamāsa*, p. 369.

when seeing men (i.e. openly) laugh, but in their tent they weep and cry bitterly. The unintelligible ובאקלם is obviously a misprint for ובאֶהֱלֶם. This foot is — — — — —, and there is no need to say that the poet violated the rules of grammar.

Another contemplative poem by Ibn Gabirol in this metre is the following:<sup>70</sup>

לֹא הִיתָה בְּפִשִּׁי מַעַט שׁוֹאֵלָה  
 לֹא הִיתָה לִילָה יוֹם עֹמָלָה  
 אֵיךְ אֶעֱלֶה [עֲתָה] וּבִמָּה אֶעֱלֶה  
 הָאֵם אֵיחֵל בְּמִשְׁכָּה תֹחֵלָה

On reading this poem one cannot help being struck by the fact that the underlying idea is Imru'-'l-Ḳeis's famous lines:<sup>71</sup>

וְלֹאֲנִי מִאֲסָעִי לִידְנִי מַעֲשֵׂה  
 כְּפִאֲנִי וְלִמְ אֶטְלֵב כְּלִיל מִן־אֲמָל  
 וְלִכְנֵמָּה אֲסָעִי לִמְגִיד מוֹטִיל  
 וְכִדּוֹ יִדְרֶךְ אֶל־מִגְדֵּי מוֹטִיל אֲמָלִי

‘Little wealth—which I seek not—would have sufficed me,  
 Had my search been in life's lower plane;  
 But the object of my quest is highest glory,  
 And my like high glory will attain.’

The idea of the second line is to be found in the continuation of Ibn Gabirol's poem, line 17:

עַל הַיָּקָר אֶחְמֹל וְהָאֵל יַעֲנֶה  
 בְּפֶשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר עַל הַיָּקָר חוֹמָלָה

<sup>70</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 37.

<sup>71</sup> Al-Fakhrī, ed. Derenbourg, p. 52.

In line 6 b read בַּפְתָּה בְּתִבְלָה.

In line 8 a read פּוֹתַחַת instead of פּוֹתַחָה.

Instead of בָּעוֹר (line 9 b) which gives no sense, and does not scan, read some such word as גָּעַר.<sup>72</sup>

In line 11 a לְמוֹפְתֵי gives no sense and no metre. Read

אָמְרוּ לְמוֹ פְתֵי זְמַנִּי יְהִישׁוּ

Line 12 a is obscure, but the metre will be restored, and perhaps the difficulty removed, if we read בְּאַדְמָתָה instead of באדמה, and לְרֹאשׁ instead of לראשו. I wonder whether אדמה does not mean here *body*. Cp. above, p. 175. The meaning would then be: *If she does not make me master of her body, the earth will not destroy my love.* אדמה would accordingly be used in two different senses, as is usually the case when a word is repeated twice in the same line. The following line would then be quite simple. The poet complains that he is not appreciated, and the loftiness which his soul attained is unknown to the outer world. His soul is despised (I take נִפְשִׁי, line 7 a, as object) by one whose good opinion he is especially anxious to acquire. What is meant by *she* is an open question. Instead of יָקָר (line 15 b) we should certainly read יִקְרָה, which is more idiomatic and restores the metre; וִירִיָּה (line 16 a) should be וִירָח, and in the second hemistich אֶמְרִי, which gives no sense and does not scan, should be changed into אֶמְרִי.

Al-Harizi has the following satire:<sup>73</sup>

פִּילִית בְּתִבֵּל שׁוֹטְטָה לֹא שִׁקְטָה

עַד כִּי בָלְבוּ מְצָאָה מְרֻגָּע

לִי נִנְעָה יָדוֹ בַּיָּם סוּף יִחַרֵּב

אִז בְּהִירוֹת חָדְלוּ לִנְבֹּעַ

<sup>72</sup> See, however, Geiger, p. 131.

<sup>73</sup> *Tahkemōm*, p. 171.

The Arabian poets in their satires (*hijā'*) often accuse their enemies of niggardliness, which is considered as the greatest vice. *Buḥl(un)* or *lu'm(un)* 'meanness' is usually the contrary of *kirāma(tun)* 'nobility', 'liberality'. It is with them a favourite idea to say that if baseness or greed assumed human form, it would look like their enemy. Ḥassān b. Thābit in satirizing Jidām says: <sup>74</sup>

אֵלֶּם תֵּרְאֵן אֶלְגֶּדֶר וְאֶלְלוּם וְאֶלְחַנָּא  
בְּנֵי מִסְכְּנָא בֵּינֵן אֶלְמַעִינִין אֶלִּי עֶרֶד

'Seest thou not that meanness, treachery, and guilt  
From Mu'cin to 'Ard—their habitation built.'

On rare occasions the Hebrew poets allowed the short syllable to be elided in the last foot of both hemistichs.

Ha-Nagid's famous 'stammering girl' has this peculiarity: <sup>75</sup>

אֵיָה צְבִי עֲלֵג וְאָנָה פָּנָה  
עֲפָר מִזָּפֶר מֶר דְּרוֹר וּלְבוֹנָה  
פִּסְפָּזָה לְבָנָה אֶת־מֵאוֹר בּוֹדֵבִים  
דּוֹר יַעֲלָה פֶסֶח מֵאוֹר הַלְבָּנָה

This poem has been translated and explained by Kaempf, Geiger, Egers, and Lagarde.<sup>76</sup> Only the last-named got hold of the right sense. The other scholars attempted to read into these humoristic lines some ideas and allusions which are alien to them. I should, however, like to add a few remarks. The last line has not been adequately explained. Lagarde, with his characteristic contempt for anything Jewish, dismisses this line with the

<sup>74</sup> *Diwān*, ed. Hirschfeld, p. 82, no. 190, l. 1.

<sup>75</sup> *Ša'ar ha-Šir*, p. 33.

<sup>76</sup> See *Mittheilungen*, III, pp. 28 ff., where all translations are quoted.

remark: <sup>77</sup> ‘*Schwerlich übersetze ich סונה der Deutung dieses “Dichters” gemäss.*’ But it seems to me that סונה in line 5 a represents the Arabic root *sāga* ‘was good, pleasant, convenient’. Thus when the girl wanted to say *sūrā* (‘be gone’), she said *sūgā*, which made the poet think of the Arabic word, and hence he hastened to her who was ‘fenced in like a lily’. For if סונה should have the same meaning in both hemistichs, there could be no reason why the writer should have hastened to her. The joke must have suggested itself to ha-Nagid when he heard a foreigner talk Arabic. Ġain and Rā are often confused by Europeans. The French *r* sounds like the Arabic Ġain, and Arabs tell many an anecdote similar to ha-Nagid’s.

(c) Another kind of this metre consists in having the third foot of both hemistichs reduced to a spondee or anapaest. Ḥassān b. Thābit has a few *ḵaṣīdas* in this metre: <sup>78</sup>

وَحَلَفْتُ لَا أَنْسَى حَدِيثَكَ مَا  
ذَكَرَ الْغَوِيُّ لَذَاذَةَ الْخَمْرِ

‘I swore your discourse never to forget  
As he who thirsts thinks of the taste of wine.’

In this form the Hebrew poets had still greater facility in forming their lines, and it is frequently met with.

Ha-Levi addressed the following lines to a friend: <sup>79</sup>

שְׁלֵמָה בְּהוֹד נִתְּנָה מְעֻפָּת  
עָבִי כְּרָקִיעַ מְחֻפָּפָת  
יָדָהּ וְאִם רוּחַ תְּנִיפָהּ  
רוּחַ בְּשָׂמִים הִיא מְנוּפָּפָת

<sup>77</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>78</sup> *Diwān*, p. 11, no. 8, l. 25.

<sup>79</sup> Brody, I, 181.

Al-Ḥarizi in his 'Anāḳ has the following epigram :<sup>80</sup>

עוֹבֵד בְּעַל יִצְרוֹ תִּנָּה שְׂבָלָהּ  
 גּוֹאֵל וְיִרְאֵת יוֹצֵרָהּ פְּדִיּוֹם  
 אֶזְ תִּשְׁכַּבָּה בְּמַח וְלֹא תִדְאָג  
 מִתַּחֲפוּכּוֹת לַיִל וְלֹא פִיד יוֹם

It should be observed that תַּחֲפוּכּוֹת in the last line has a meaning which is not quite identical with that of the Bible. It does not denote *perversities*, but *vicissitudes*, and stands for Arabic *ṣurūf(un)* 'vicissitudes, turnings', which occurs often followed by *dahr* 'time'.

Ha-Nagid has a long poem in this metre :<sup>81</sup>

רְעִי הִתְתַּאֲוֵן וְתִדְוָה עַל  
 זֶה הַזְמַן כִּי הִשְׁקֵד בְּעַל  
 תִּדְאָג לְשֶׁה עֲוִים אֲשֶׁר עָלָהּ  
 בְּדִין וְדָב יִרַד וְלֹא יַעַל

This mode of Kāmil has been given by Jewish writers as Sarī'. There is no real objection to this explanation, and it is hard to say which metre the poet had in mind, since the contracted Sarī' would have the same appearance.

(d) What is known as the shorter Kāmil, is a metre consisting of four feet instead of six in each line. The rhyme-bearing hemistich has an extra long syllable added to it. The last foot is then said to be *muraḥḥal* 'having a train'. Its form is :

— | — ∪ — ∪∪ | — ∪ — ∪∪ || — ∪ — ∪∪ | — ∪ — ∪∪

The following lines are attributed to Šureiḥ b. 'Imrān :<sup>82</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Brody's ed., no. 222.

<sup>81</sup> Harkavy's ed, p. 20.

<sup>82</sup> Nöldeke, *Delectus*, p. 4.

آخِ الْكَرَامَ إِذَا وَجَدَ -  
 تَ إِلَى إِخَائِهِمْ سَمِيلاً  
 فَاشْرَبْ بِكَأْسِهِمْ وَإِنْ  
 تَشْرَبْ بِدِ الْسَمِّ الثُّمِيلَا

'Let noble people be your friends ;  
 When you sought not their love in vain,  
 Drink from their cup, and do not fear,  
 Though deadly poison it contain.'

Ha-Levi has the following poem : <sup>83</sup>

שָׁלוֹם לְךָ הָרַ הָעֲבָרִים  
 שָׁלוֹם לְךָ מִכָּל עֲבָרִים  
 בָּךְ נִאֶסֶף מִבְּחַר אֲנִישׁ  
 וַיְהִי בָךְ מִבְּחַר קְבָרִים

Brody <sup>84</sup> classes this metre among the *unbestimmte* !

For a fifth probable kind of this metre, see below,  
p. 220.

#### 4. Wāfir, *ample*.

This metre may be called a companion to Kāmil. Its feet are built on the same principle, that is to say, they must have three long syllables and a short one. The order of the syllables, however, is different. It is the *Epitritus primus* (— — — ˘), but for the third syllable two short ones may be substituted. A hemistich is composed of such three feet, and is always catalectic.

Its form is

— — ˘ | — ˘˘ — ˘ | — ˘˘ — ˘ || — — ˘ | — ˘˘ — ˘ | — ˘˘ — ˘

<sup>83</sup> Brody's ed., II, p. 159.

<sup>84</sup> *Metrx.*, p. 49 d.

The Arabian poets employed it very frequently, and their Hebrew followers have a special predilection for it. Obviously the fact that the short syllable is to be at the beginning of the foot makes it an easy task for the Hebrew poet. For it is usually possible to add ו or one of the letters of **בכל"ם** whenever a *šwā mobile* is required. The greater bulk of ha-Nagid's poems are in this metre, and it is quite a favourite with most poets. Brody and Rosin, however, exclude Wāfir entirely, and call this metre Hazaj. They follow Sa'adyā b. Dannān in this respect. Kaempf is the only one who considers it possible to call this metre Wāfir, but even he seems to be undecided. A comparison of the Hazaj and Wāfir in Arabic will make it certain that the Hebrew metre with which we are now dealing is the latter. To begin with, the Hazaj never occurs with six feet. The Arab grammarians with their harmonizing tendency have suggested that in theory six feet may be allowed, but in practice only four should be employed. But no mention is made of this imaginary form being catalectic, a form which it always assumes in Hebrew. Moreover, the Hazaj in any form is so rare in Arabic that many Dīwāns do not contain it at all, and this fact in itself ought to be sufficient to reject the hypothesis that the Hebrew poets employed it exceedingly frequently. On the other hand Wāfir is composed of six feet, and is always catalectic, as in Hebrew. It is one of the most dignified metres in Arabic, and Hebrew poets were right in introducing it into their language. Here again, as in the case of Kāmil, in many instances a light vowel with its *šwā mobile* will be regarded as two short syllables.



'Amr b. Kulthūm's *Mu'allaka* is in this metre: <sup>85</sup>

قَفَى قَبْلَ التَّفَرُّقِ يَا ظَعِيمَنَا  
نُخَبِّرُكَ الْيَقِينِ وَتُخَبِّرُنَا

'Thou who art departing, stand awhile and wait !  
We'll converse in truth before we separate.'

The famous poem of Joseph b. Ḥasdai is in this metre: <sup>86</sup>

הַלְצִבִּי חֲזַן בְּבִירַת אוֹן וְעֶצְמָה  
לְהַחֲזִיטָהּ רִדִּיר אֶפֶל בְּשִׁלְמָה  
וְלַחֲזוֹת בּוֹכְבִּי נֶשֶׁף וְלַחֲזוֹת  
בְּעִי מִדְּבַר מַעֲזוֹן פֶּחֶד וְאִמָּה

Goldziher in his brilliant article in *JQR.*, XIV, 734, has sufficiently explained this figure of speech of herding the stars. He quotes, among others, a poem by Ḥassān b. Thābit's sister, in which she describes her inability to sleep owing to some grief. But Ḥassān b. Thābit himself has a poem which, I think, will most appropriately illustrate this metaphor: <sup>87</sup>

تَطَاوَلَ بِالْخَمَانِ لَيْلِي فَلَمْ تَكْدُ  
تَهْمُ هَوَادِي نَجْمِي أَنْ تَصَوَّبَا  
أَبَيْتُ أُرَاعِيهَا كَأَنِّي مُوَكَّلٌ  
بِهَا لَا أُرِيدُ النَّوْمَ حَتَّى تَغِيَّبَا  
إِذَا غَارَ مِنْهَا كَوْكَبٌ بَعْدَ كَوْكَبٍ  
تُرَاقِبُ عَيْنِي آخِرَ اللَّيْلِ كَوْكَبَا

<sup>85</sup> Lyall, p. 110, l. 9.

<sup>86</sup> *Ša'ar ha-Šir*, p. 27.

<sup>87</sup> *Diwān*, p. 27.

‘While at Ḥammān my night seemed long without an end,  
 As though the foremost stars to set did not intend ;  
 Until they disappeared I tended heaven’s hordes—  
 Till then no sleep for me !—as though they were my wards ;  
 And when star after star was vanishing from sight  
 My eye kept vigil on the last star of the night.’

It should be added that *rāʿā* in Arabic has the meaning of *tending the flock* (as in Hebrew) as well as *watching* in general. The expression *rāʿā-n-nujūma* has been taken literally by Lane. Other scholars take it as a figure of speech in which the stars are represented as sheep.<sup>88</sup> Whatever the explanation is, the meaning is quite clear. The Arabs were so familiar with this metaphor that a contemporary of Hārūn al-Rašīd (Muslim b. al-Walīd) says :<sup>89</sup>

لَوْ كَانَ مَا بِي مِثْلَ مَا بِكَ لَمْ أَتِ  
 نَدَمًا أَحْزَانٍ صَدِيقِ كَوَاكِبِ

‘If my feelings were like yours I should not spend the night  
 A companion of sadness, comrade to the stars.’

Ha-Nagid has the following poem :<sup>90</sup>

נִשְׁמָה מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּתְּאוּ פְּרוּעָה  
 וְנִפְשׁ מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁאֵל מְנוּעָה

Line 7 of this poem requires explanation. It is

וְאֵם רֹאשִׁי בְּצִיצִית רֹאשׁ פְּרוּעָה  
 וְבֵת עֵץ בְּפוּקֵי לֵיל קְרוּעָה

Brody in his notes to ha-Levi’s *Dīwān* (I, p. 164) quotes numerous passages from other poets who made use of this

<sup>88</sup> See Nöldeke, *Delectus*, p. 94, note to lines 2, 3.

<sup>89</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 148, l. 6.

<sup>90</sup> Brody’s ed., p. 108.

expression. But the explanation remains incomplete till we know the purport of this metaphor in Arabic, whence it was directly borrowed. As is well known, it is the custom in the Orient to insert stibium into the eyes. When a person spends the night without sleep he is said to have inserted night's stibium, that is to say, the blackness of the night, into his eyes. Both the *Lisān al-'Arab*<sup>91</sup> and *Taj al-'Arūs*<sup>92</sup> attribute the following statement to Abū 'Amr:

يقال لرجل يسهر ليلة ساريا او عاملا فلان يجعل الليل اثمدا  
ای يسهر فجعل سواد الليل لعينية كالاثمد

*It is said of a man who spends the night without sleep, travelling or working, he made the night his stibium, that is to say, he watches, and puts the blackness of night into his eyes like stibium.*

Ibn Gabirol also has many poems in this metre:<sup>93</sup>

בְּשִׁרְשׁ עֵץ יְהִי אֶרֶץ אֲמִירִי  
וּכְתִבּוֹנֶת אֲנֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲמִירִי  
וּכְמִזְמֹת לְבַב אִישׁ בֵּן יְגֹנֵה  
בְּשֹׁר מָרָם יְבֹאֲהוּ מְנִירִי

In Dukes' edition the metre is in some places corrupt, and Egers<sup>94</sup> has restored the text. In line 12 b I recognize in וְיִרְי an Arabism which is very frequent in mediaeval Hebrew poetry. Whether Hebrew וְיִרְי is to be connected with Arabic *durra(tun)* is a matter open to dispute, and philologists are not unanimous on this point. But it is quite certain that in the Bible וְיִרְי denotes a kind of stone, whereas here it obviously means a *pearl* = Arabic *durra(tun)*. Ibn

<sup>91</sup> IV, p. 75.

<sup>92</sup> II, p. 312.

<sup>93</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 22.

<sup>94</sup> Zunz, *Jubelschrift*, p. 197.

Gabirol's line reminds us of Al-Ḥariri's grammatical treatise *durratu-l-jawwās* 'the Pearl of the Diver'.

Line 37 has been misunderstood by Egers, who was therefore driven to emend it violently :

וְאֶסֶר מֵעַל עֵינַי לְבָבִי  
בְּהַתָּלוֹת אֶפֶר לַיֵּל אֶפְרָיו

Dukes has rightly pointed out that the poet has 1 Kings 20. 41 in mind. We should accordingly translate : *I shall remove the coverings from my heart's* (i.e. perhaps, *mind's*) *eyes when night's covering is suspended.* See the preceding line and Goldziher's explanation of it in *JQR.*, XIV, 720. I have rendered אֶפֶר by *covering* in accordance with the opinion of the best authorities. It is, however, likely that Ibn Gabirol took it to be identical with אֶפֶר *ashes*. Should this view be right we should have here the metaphor of פִּיקָה לַיֵּל which was explained above. A similar expression occurs in the *Dīwān* of Muslim b. al-Walīd : <sup>95</sup>

فَبَاتَ يُتَاجَى النَّجْمَ حَتَّى كَانَمَا  
يُخَالِسُ عَيْنَيْهِ الْكَرَى لَيْلُ أَرَمَدٍ

'He was communing with the stars until  
The ashy night deprived his eyes of sleep.'

Egers suggests the following reading :

וְאֶסֶר מֵעַל עֵינַי לְבָבִי  
בְּהַתָּלוֹת מֵאֶפֶר לַיֵּל אֶפְרָיו

After my explanation of the text there is no need to comment on this emendation.

<sup>95</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 59, l. 3.

Ha-Levi has the following poem:<sup>96</sup>

הַתְּרִדָּה נַעֲרוֹת אַחֵר חֲמוּשִׁים  
וַיִּמְיֶד לְהַתְעוֹפֵף חֲמוּשִׁים

Here נַעֲרוֹת probably represents Arabic *ṣiba(n)* (see above, p. 188). About קלעים (line 14 a) it should be remarked that although קלעי הספינה occurs in Mishnic Hebrew in the sense of 'sails', it is doubtful whether ha-Levi would have used it in that signification without ספינה, had he not been influenced by Arabic *ḵil'ū(n)*.

Moses Ibn Ezra in his *Taršīš* has the following lines:<sup>97</sup>

תְּלִינָתִי עָלַי מְרִיב אֲשֶׁר לֹא  
יְהִי נִבְלָם בְּתוֹכָהֶם וְנִבְסָה  
הִיתְנַפַּח אֲנוּשׁ יוֹזֵב כְּבֵרו  
לְדוֹר כָּלָה מֵאֵד אֵלָיו וְנִבְסָה

The 'quarreller' here is *ʿādīl(un)* 'reviler', who plays such an important part in Arabic love poems. For יוֹזֵב כְּבֵרו compare the line of Ṣimma b. ʿAbdullah:<sup>98</sup>

وَأَذْكُرُ أَيَّامَ الْحَمَى ثُمَّ أَنْتَنِي  
عَلَى كَيْدِي مِنْ خَشْيَةٍ أَنْ تَصَدَّعَا

'When I recall the days which at Himā I spent  
I turn unto my liver, fearing it be rent.'

Al-Ḥarizi in his *Tahkemōnī* has the following epigram:<sup>99</sup>

יְמִינָה מְנַהֵר פִּישׁוֹן רַחֲבָה  
וְלֶה בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים הַנִּבְרָה  
לֶה נִפֶּשׁ אֲשֶׁר תַּפִּיץ יְאוּרִים  
וְהִיא מִלְּהָבֵי הָאֵשׁ חֲצִיבָה

<sup>96</sup> Harkavy's ed., I, p. 28.

<sup>98</sup> *Ḥamāsa*, p. 540; *Delectus*, p. 16.

<sup>97</sup> p. 61.

<sup>99</sup> 186.

וְלוֹ נָנְעָה יָמִין כָּל קוֹפְצֵי יָד  
 וְכָל פִּילֵי בִדְדָה הַנְּדִיבָה  
 אֲוִי שָׁבוּ בְּגִי חֲרָדָה נְרִיבִים  
 וְלֹא נִשְׁאָר אֶנּוּשׁ פִּילֵי בְּצוּבָה

Goldziher in his article referred to above<sup>100</sup> fully explained the figure of speech in which a liberal man is compared to the rain and rivers. It should be added that in Arabic almost all words denoting *moisture* signify *liberality*. One need only mention *jāda* 'was kind, liberal', 'rained abundantly'; *nada(n)* 'moisture', 'liberality'; *ḡamr(un)* 'deep', 'copious rain', 'liberal, generous', especially in the expression *ḡamru-l-ḡulḡi*.

שָׁבוּ in line 3 a is an Arabism. It corresponds to Arabic *ṣāra* = 'he returned, became'. Biblical Hebrew would have required הָיוּ followed by ל, and this would have disturbed the metre.

### 5. Ḥafif, *light*.

This is a compound metre composed of *fā'ilātun* and *mustaf'ilun* in the following way:

— — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — — || — — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — —

Keis b. Darīḥ says:<sup>101</sup>

בֵּיתָ וְאַלְהֵם יָא לְבִינִי שְׂחִיבִי  
 וְגִרְתָּ מִדְּנֹאֵית עֵינִי דְמוּעִי

'I spent the night with care as the companion of my bed,  
And since you from my side departed copious tears I shed.'

Ha-Nagid has the following poem:<sup>102</sup>

דְּבָרוּ נָא לְבַת מְלָכִים בְּבוּדָה  
 הָאֲמוּנָה עָלֵי קַצִּיעוֹת וְקִדָּה  
 הַיִּשְׁנָה בַּצְּהָרִים וְלָה נֹתֵד  
 נֹת לְבִיתָה שְׁאֵר בְּלֹא הֵינּוּ וּמִדָּה

<sup>100</sup> *JQR.*, XIV, 724.

<sup>101</sup> Nöldeke, *Delectus*, p. 6.

<sup>102</sup> Harkavy's ed., p. 7.

Ha-Levi's poem which Brody quotes<sup>103</sup> should be thus vocalized :

לוּ שְׁחָרִים יִרְדְּפוּנִי בְּרוּחַ  
הַמִּנְשֵׁק פִּיהַּ וְנוֹפֶה יְנוֹפֶה  
וְעֲנָנִים לוֹ נִשְׁאוּ לָהּ שְׁלֹמִי  
אִזּוּ בְּמַתְנֶה קָשִׁי לְכַבֶּה יְרוֹפֶה  
יַעֲלֶה בְּחֶרֶה עָלַי עֵשׂ מְנוּחָה  
בְּחִמִּי אֶל אֲשֶׁר עָרִי עֵשׂ יַעֲוֶפֶה

Al-Harizi in his *Mahberet Itiel* has this poem :<sup>104</sup>

שׁוֹאֲלִי לַעֲמֹד בְּסוּדֵי דַעָה כִּי  
לָהּ בְּלִבִּי מַעֲלָה בְּמֵרוֹם אַחֲוָה  
תִּהְדָּפְנִי אֶרֶץ לְאֶרֶץ וְאִשׁוּמַ  
כָּל עֲרָבָה לְחִסּוֹת בְּאַלּוֹן וְתִרְוָה

The metre and rhyme of the original is imitated not unsuccessfully. In line 1 b I emended אחוה of Chenery's edition into אַחֲוָה on account of the rhyme and sense.

Moses Ibn Ezra also has a few lines in this metre :<sup>105</sup>

הַנִּבִּיר נִכְבְּלִי בְּאוֹרֶךְ מְאוֹרִי  
יוֹם וְלַיְלָה בְּצִהְרֵם עֲרָבִים

Here also וְלַיְלָה = Arabic *ṣāra*. See above, p. 205.

Abraham Ibn Ezra has the following line :<sup>106</sup>

אֵב הַמֶּזֶן מִלְּבֶשֶׁת יְחִידוֹ לְעִבְדִּי  
בְּהִלָּכָה אֲשֶׁר בְּדַת מַחְמַדִּי

<sup>103</sup> *Metra*, p. 39.

<sup>105</sup> *Taršīš*, p. 21.

<sup>104</sup> p. 87.

<sup>106</sup> Egers's ed., p. 6.

6. Sari', *swift*.

(a) This metre, which occurs now and again in Arabic, is composed of two feet of the *mustaf'ilun* kind with its incidental variations, followed by — ʾ — in each hemistich. Its normal form is

— ʾ — | — ʾ — ʾ — | — ʾ — ʾ — || — ʾ — | — ʾ — ʾ — | — ʾ — ʾ —

Abū-l-ʿAtāhiya has the following line:<sup>107</sup>

يَقْدِرُ الْإِنْسَانُ فِي نَفْسِهِ  
أَمْرًا وَيُتَابَهُ عَلَيْهِ الْقَفَا

‘A man resolves to act, but fate  
All his intentions will frustrate.’

It is not frequent in Hebrew, but ha-Levi has the following lines in this metre:<sup>108</sup>

יוֹנֵת רְחוּקִים נִדְרָה יַעֲרָה  
בְּשִׁלָּה וְלֹא יִכְלָה לְהַתְנַעֲרָה

Al-Harizi in his *Maḥberet Itiel* has this poem:<sup>109</sup>

בֵּינוּ בְּנֵי שִׁבְלִי וְשִׁמְעוּ לְגִיב  
לֵב כָּל בְּנֵי שִׁבְלִי וּבֵין יַאֲדִיב  
שְׂרַתִּי אַחִי נָאֻן וְאַמֶּן מִשׁ  
מַח אֹהֲבָיו גַּם אוֹיְבָיו יַעֲצִיב

אחי (line 2 a) stands for Arabic *ahā*, which is often used in the sense of possessor. This usage occurs quite frequently in this literature, especially in the phrase מוֹסֵר אחי.

(b) The Arabs allow sometimes, for reasons which were

<sup>107</sup> *Dīwān*, Beyrout ed., p. 4.

<sup>108</sup> Harkavy's ed., p. 60.

<sup>109</sup> p. 60.



explained above,<sup>110</sup> the rhyme-bearing foot to be reduced to a spondee. The form of the metre is then

--| - - - | - - - || - - - | - - - | - - -

Abū-l-'Atāhiya says:<sup>111</sup>

مَنْ طَلَبَ الْعِزَّ لِيَبْقَى بِهِ  
فَإِنَّ عِزَّ الْمَرْءِ تَقْوَاهُ

'He who seeks glory shall remain in it;  
And lo! man's glory is his piety.'

Al-Ḥarizi in *Maḥberet Itiel* says:<sup>112</sup>

הָאֵל רָפָאֲנִי וְאֹדְדָה שְׁמוֹ  
מִפְּחָלָה בְּמַעַט תְּמִיחִנִּי  
וְיִחַבְּדֹשׁ צִירִי וּבְאַחֲרִית  
לִירִי תְּמוֹתָה עוֹד יִבְיֵאֲנִי

For another possible variation of Sarī' see above, p. 197.

## 7. Matakārib, *tripping*.

(a) This is a simple metre composed of *fa'ūlun* repeated four times in each hemistich. Its normal form is

-- - - | - - - | - - - | - - - || - - - | - - - | - - - | - - -

Muslim b. al-Walīd has this line:<sup>113</sup>

خَلِيلِي لَسْتُ أَرَى الْهَبَّ عَارًا  
فَلَا تَعْدُلَانِي خَلَعْتُ الْعِذَارَا

'My friends, I see in love no cause for shame,  
I cast off all restraint, withhold your blame!'

<sup>110</sup> See above, p. 166.

<sup>112</sup> p. 60.

<sup>111</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 12.

<sup>113</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 151.

Ha-Levi has this poem composed on a wedding: <sup>114</sup>

מְלוֹנֶת הַדְּרָסִים וְעָרֵשׁ בְּשָׂמִים  
 לְתַאֲמֵי צְבִיָּה בְּמִנּוֹל תְּאוֹמִים  
 לְנֶצֶר נְדִיבִים וְחֹמֶר נְצִיבִים  
 לְכָל לֵב אֲהוּבִים בְּכָל פֶּה נְעִימִים

The Hebrew poets in employing this metre were fond of dividing the hemistichs into two equal parts, usually rhyming with each other. Instances may be found in ha-Levi's *Dīwān* (Brody's edition, II, p. 184), and in the following poem by al-Ḥarizi: <sup>115</sup>

בְּמַלְיִם חֲשׂוּקִים בְּנֶפֶת מְתָקִים  
 וְאַל רוֹדְפֵיהֶם קְרוּבִים רְחוּקִים

As in the case of Ṭawīl, the Arabian poets allow the first short syllable of the first line to be omitted.

Al-Ḥutei'a has this poem: <sup>116</sup>

أَعْطَى ابْنُ قُرْطٍ غَدَاةَ السَّلَیْ —  
 مَ لَمَّا التَّقَيْنَا عَطَاءَ جَزَیْلَا

‘Ibn Qurṭ gave munificent gifts  
 On the morning we met at Suleim.’

Moses Ibn Ezra made use of this privilege in this verse: <sup>117</sup>

חֶלֶק חֲסָדִים בְּחֶלֶק חֲסָדָיו  
 וְשֶׁבֶט מְרֻדִים בְּלֶקֶט קִצְרוֹ  
 וְעַיִן בֵּין בְּעֵלָיו הַרּוּפֹת בְּעֵלָיו  
 וְעַר יָם הָעֹדָה יִשְׁלַח קִצְרוֹ

<sup>114</sup> Brody's ed., II, p. 14.

<sup>116</sup> *Dīwān*, ed. Goldziher, p. 181.

<sup>115</sup> *Taḥkemōnī*, p. 15.

<sup>117</sup> *Taršīḥ*, p. 25.

(b) Very often this metre is catalectic, especially in the rhymeless hemistich. The *ridf*<sup>118</sup> usually causes the second hemistich to remain acatalectic.

Ḥassān Ibn Thābit glorifies his clan in this metre :<sup>119</sup>

وَرِثْنَا مَسَاكِنَهُمْ بَعْدَهُمْ  
وَكُنَّا مُلُوكًا بِهَا لَمْ نَزِمْ

‘We inherited their dwelling-places

After them, and ceased not to be masters.’

In Hebrew this metre is rare. Ha-Levi has also this variation :<sup>120</sup>

יְמִין עוֹד אֶל יָד עוֹרֵד  
נִשְׁלַח לַעֲזֹר אֶת נִשְׁאָר עוֹרֵד

#### 8. Ramal, *running*.

(a) This metre consists of the foot *fā'ilātun* repeated three times in each hemistich. It is usually catalectic, and its normal form is

— — — | — — — — — | — — — — — || — — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — —

Abū-l-'Atāhiya has this line :<sup>121</sup>

مَنْ يَعْشِ يَكْبُرُ وَمَنْ يَكْبُرُ يَمُتْ  
وَالْمَنَايَا لَا تَبَالِي مَنْ أَتَتْ

‘Whoever lives grows old, and he whose hair is hoary  
Will die ; and fate cares not whom it is overtaking.’

Ha-Levi expressed his trust in God in this metre :<sup>122</sup>

אֶל יְדֵי אֱלֹהֵי חַי יְהִי לָךְ מַחְסֶה  
אִם בְּחַמִּים וְאִם בְּתַחֲסֶה

<sup>118</sup> See above, p. 166.

<sup>119</sup> *Diwān*, p. 12, l. 20.

<sup>120</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 5.

<sup>121</sup> *Diwān*, p. 39.

<sup>122</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 147.

Abraham Ibn Ezra has this line : <sup>123</sup>

אֶבְטָחָה עַל פּוֹעֲלִי עַד אֲנוּעָה  
אֲשַׁכְּבָה בְּטַח וְלֹא אֶתְרוּעָה

(b) Sometimes this metre is of two feet in each hemistich, and is then

— — — — | — — — — || — — — — | — — — —

Abū-l-'Atāhiya says : <sup>124</sup>

أَيُّهَا الْعَمِدُ إِلَى كَمِّ تَشْتَرِي الْعَيَّ بِرُشْدِكَ

‘O slave, how long will you barter rectitude for error?’

Ha-Levi has a piyyūt in this metre : <sup>125</sup>

יַעֲנֶה בִּי מַחֲלָלָה צִיר בְּלִי דְמִיּוֹן וְעֶרְף  
בְּקֹחַל נֶגֶד דְּבִירָה יֶאֱחֹז רָעַר וּמֶרֶץ

Abraham Ibn Ezra has this prayer : <sup>126</sup>

אֵי גְבוּרָתְךָ יָמִין אֵל לִשְׁמַע אֲזִין שְׁמַעְתִּיךָ  
נִזְאָשָׁה נִפְשִׁי לְהָרִים רֹאשׁ בְּאֵלָיו לֹא יִדְעֶתִיךָ

### 9. Munsariḥ, *flowing*.

This is a compound metre closely resembling Basīt. Its normal form is

— — — | — — — — | — — — — || — — — — | — — — — | — — — —

Muslim b. al-Walīd says : <sup>127</sup>

وَطَارَ نَوْمِي وَالْعَيْنُ تَنْدُبُهُ  
وَجَدًا عَلَيَّ وَعَادَنِي سُهُدِي

‘My sleep has fled, my eye kept on inviting it,  
Out of anxiety, but sleeplessness did visit me.’

<sup>123</sup> Egers's ed., p. 1. <sup>124</sup> *Diwān*, p. 86, l. 10. <sup>125</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 5.

<sup>126</sup> Egers's ed., p. 50.

<sup>127</sup> *Diwān*, p. 218, l. 4.

This metre hardly ever occurs in Hebrew. Ha-Levi, however, has a few poems in it:<sup>128</sup>

יֵאֱמִין לְבָבָהּ וּמוֹעֲדָהּ יִחְלִי  
מִה תַּחֲשֹׁבִי קִין שָׂבִי וְתַתְּבַחֲלִי

Brody, who classes this metre among the *unbestimmte*, thinks it possible that ha-Levi was its 'inventor'.<sup>129</sup> Sa'adyā b. Dannān gives Munsariḥ as one of the four metres which do not exist in Hebrew.<sup>130</sup> At the end follows the contradictory remark: 'I saw some poems in this metre in our literature.' However, Sa'adyā's Munsariḥ does not agree with that employed by the Arabs.

#### 10. Hazaj, *trilling*.

This metre is antispastic, and consists of two feet in each hemistich. Its normal form is

— — — — — | — — — — — || — — — — — | — — — — —

Al-Find says:<sup>131</sup>

وَفِي الشَّرِّ نَجَاةٌ حَيْثُ لَا يُنْجِيكَ إِحْسَانُ

'There may be safety in evil, when doing good brings no succour.'

In Hebrew this metre is not rarely met with. Ha-Nagid has the following dirge:<sup>132</sup>

הַבְּמוֹת פְּלִילִיָּה      וּמִשְׁכַּב תְּרוֹמִיָּה ?  
יְרִידִי בְּקִשּׁוֹ נָא לִי      צָרִי לְבָאֵב וּלְכִיָּה

Brody in his notes to ha-Nagid's *Dīwān* remarks that פְּלִילִיָּה denotes *device*. But such a signification is unwarranted. It is likely that פְּלִילִיָּה represents Arabic *kadā'* (*un*),

<sup>128</sup> Harkavy, I, p. 57.

<sup>129</sup> *Metra*, p. 48 c.

<sup>130</sup> *Meleket ha-Šīr*, p. 17.

<sup>131</sup> *Hamāsa*, p. 11.

<sup>132</sup> Brody's ed., p. 1.

which means *decision, mastery, power*. We should therefore translate: *Is there any power against death?*

Ibn Gabirol has a love poem in a light vein in this metre: <sup>133</sup>

תִּבְרַךְ מִבְּלִי קֶצֶה      בְּכָל תְּבוּאָה וְכָל תַּעֲצָא  
קָרָאֲנִי שְׁלוֹחַדָּךְ      וְהִיא נִחְפֹּז וּמִתְרַצָּה

This is the ordinary description one meets in most poems of this type in which the poet's hope is realized.

Line 7

וְהַצֹּפֶה יְהִי נִרְדָּם      וְרוֹאוֹתָיו מָעַם יַעֲצָה

is almost a literal translation of Muslim b. al-Walīd's line: <sup>134</sup>

هَدَّتِ الْعُيُونُ وَنَامَ كُلُّ مُرَاقِبٍ

'The eyes were closed (*lit.* quiet) and every watchman slept.'

Moses Ibn Ezra in his *Taršūš* has these lines: <sup>135</sup>

בִּבְת כָּרֶם יִירִדִי עַל  
בְּנוֹת יָמִים יָמִי עַד נִרְדָּ  
אֲשֶׁר טַעְמוֹ כְּטַעַם צִיף  
וְזָכְרוּ מִרְ וְעֵינֵי נִרְדָּ

The expression כָּרֶם בֵּת as a designation for wine is frequent in Arabic. Muslim b. al-Walīd says: <sup>136</sup>

وَقَهَوْتُ مِنْ بَنَاتِ الْكَرْمِ صَافِيَةً

'Pure wine from the daughters of the vineyard.'

Ha-Levi has the following lines addressed to a friend: <sup>137</sup>

אֶרְוֶן חֲכָמָה אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו  
מִכּוֹן מִקְדָּשׁ וְאוֹהֶלָיו

<sup>133</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 55.

<sup>134</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 149, no. 23, l. 26 b.

<sup>135</sup> p. 34.

<sup>136</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 178, no. 32, l. 19 a.

<sup>137</sup> Brody's ed., I, p. 38.

11. Mujtatt, *computed*.

This metre does not occur in the *Dīwāns* of the earlier poets, and some scholars are of opinion that al-Ḥalīl invented it. It is a compound metre consisting of *Mustaf'ilun* and *fā'ilātun*. Its form is

— — — — | — — — — || — — — — | — — — —

The following line is quoted in al-Fakhrī: <sup>138</sup>

قُلْ لِّلْخَلِيفَةِ مَهْلًا      أَتَاكَ مَا لَا تُحِبُّ

‘Go and tell the Caliph: be not rash,  
Something which you like not comes to you.’

Hebrew poets employed this metre now and again. Ha-Nagid has this epigram: <sup>139</sup>

אִם יַעֲשֶׂה אִישׁ דְּבָרִים      לֹא יִשְׂרֹם לוֹ יִשְׂרָיִם  
יִצְרוּ יִסִּיתוֹ לְמַחֵר      לַעֲשׂוֹת דְּבָרִים אֲחֵרִים

Ibn Gabirol's famous poem, written on his leaving Saragossa, is in this metre: <sup>140</sup>

נָחַר בְּקִרְאִי גִּרּוֹנִי  
דָּבַק לְחֻבִּי לְשׁוֹנִי

There are in the printed edition a few corruptions which should be rectified. In line 2 a read לְבָבִי אֲנִי (in line 13 b) should be changed perhaps to וְעֵנִי (cp. Ps. 25. 16) or לְקוֹנִי. Instead of כָּאֵלּוּ (line 17 a) read בְּלֵאֵי. Read אֲזוֹנָהֶם (line 28 a) instead of אֲזוֹנֵיהֶם. Line 31 is corrupt. It should perhaps be read

אֲטִיף בְּשִׁמְי עֲלֵיהֶם      בְּרָפֶם וְנִם קִנְמוֹנִי

<sup>138</sup> Derenbourg's ed., p. 64.

<sup>139</sup> Harkavy, p. 128.

<sup>140</sup> Dukes, p. 1.

ישימו (line 33 a) should be ישימוֹן. In line 35 b transfer ו of וחמשי to שני in accordance with Hebrew idiom and metre. Insert אַת before רְצוֹנִי (line 37 b). In line 42 insert לִי before שָׁבָה, and פֶּה after שָׁבָה. Instead of על (line 43) read עָלַי. Change עוֹד (line 44 a) into עֲרִנָּה. Delete ב of במצות (line 50b).

Al-Ḥarizi has in his *Tahkemōnī* the following lines: <sup>141</sup>

עַר רַב פִּשְׁעֵי דְמַעֵי      נָבְרוּ וְאִידֵי יִכְפֵּם  
קָפְאוּ אֶבְלֵ אִשׁ לִבִּי      יִשְׁלַח דְּבָרוֹ וְיִמָּסֵם

The following poem by ha-Levi is interesting, as it shows the optional use of the long syllable at the beginning of the line: <sup>142</sup>

יְמִין אֲדוֹנִי הֲלֹא אַתָּה      הָיִיתָ לְעוֹר כְּנָגְדִי  
הֵיךְ תִּמְשָׁשִׁנִי כְּהִיוֹם      בְּבוֹר מְצוּקוֹת לִבִּי

## 12. Madīd, *extended*.

(a) This metre is built on the same principle as Ṭawīl and Basīṭ, but occurs very rarely. It is compound, and consists of *fā'ilātun*, and *fā'ilun* occurring alternately. Its form when of four feet is

— ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ || — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡

A woman bewailing the death of her son says: <sup>143</sup>

לֵיטָתָהּ לִלְמִי שָׁאֵהָ שְׁבִירָה עֲנָה מֶלֶךְ  
לֵיטָתָהּ נַפְסִי קִדְמַתָּ לִלְמֵנָיָא בְּדִלְכָּה

‘Would that my heart controlled its grief; would in your stead

My soul as victim to relentless fate were led.’

<sup>141</sup> p. 51.

<sup>142</sup> Harkavy, I, p. 56.

<sup>143</sup> *Ḥamāsa*, p. 415.



Hebrew poets had little reason to employ this metre; it is hard to wield, and since it was not popular with the masters, it had no attraction for the followers. Ha-Levi has the following piyyūt,<sup>144</sup> which may be taken for a Madīd. *Fā'ilun*, as is sometimes the case with Basīt, was reduced to a spondee, and the metre then became

— — | — — — — | — — | — — — — || — — | — — — — | — — | — — — —

עַם בְּךָ יִבְחִירוּ                      יִשְׁעֶךָ יִבְרִירוּ  
וְשִׁמְךָ יִקְדִּישׁוּ                      נְשִׁיר בְּנֵשִׁי יִגְשׁוּ

(b) More frequently this metre is of three feet. It is then

— — — — | — — — — | — — — — || — — — — | — — — — | — — — —

Abū-l-'Atāhiya has the following line:<sup>145</sup>

إِنَّمَا أَنْتَ بِوَادِي الْمَنَابَا  
إِنْ رَمَاكَ الْمَوْتُ فِيمَا أَصَابَا

'Lo, you are dwelling in fate's vale,  
When death strikes you, it will not fail.'

Abraham Ibn Ezra, who seems to have a special fondness for rare metres, has the following piyyūt:<sup>146</sup>

אֶשְׁמְחָה כִּי אֶפְתָּחָה פִּי לְהוֹדוֹת  
אֶעֱנֶה טוֹב מִעֲנֵה שִׁיר יִרְדּוֹת

Ha-Levi's following poem seems to be in this metre.<sup>147</sup> The concluding line of each strophe, however, is quite independent.

בּוֹא יִדְרִי בּוֹא לְבֵית בֵּת נְרִיבִים                      נִתְעַלְסָה בְּאַהֲבִים  
יַעֲלֶת חֵן בְּךָ תִּעְלָה לְחַשֵּׁק                      וּבְכַפִּיף חֲנִי בְּשָׂרִים לְנֹשֶׁק

<sup>144</sup> Brody, III, p. 13.

<sup>146</sup> Egers's ed., p. 20.

<sup>145</sup> *Dīwān*, p. 28, l. 9.

<sup>147</sup> Brody's ed., II, p. 320.

Modern Jewish writers on prosody make no mention of this metre in either form. Even Rosin,<sup>148</sup> who is supposed to give an exhaustive account of Ibn Ezra's metres, makes no allusion to this one. Sa'adyā b. Dannān, however, after enumerating twelve metres which Hebrew poets employed, gives four more which, he asserts, are only to be found in Arabic poetry.<sup>149</sup> Madīd is one of the four, and is quite accurate. It is the second kind, and is as follows:<sup>150</sup>

בֹּכְבִי אֶרְצִי נִבְרִי בְּנִי שִׁיר  
יִוְשְׁבֵי דִוְכָן בְּבֵית הַבְּחִירָה

After this follows the statement: *I have seen very few poems in this metre in Hebrew.* This flatly contradicts the assertion of the preceding page, and can hardly be right. Perhaps he meant to say *in Arabic*.

13. Mutadārik, *continuous*, or Mutadārak, *supplied*.

This metre is rare in Arabic. Its normal form is

— — — | — — — | — — — | — — — || — — — | — — — | — — — | — — —

In Hebrew it is certainly rarer than in Arabic. Kaempfer<sup>151</sup> quotes the following line by Ibn Gabirol :

אֶרְשֶׁת חֶסֶדְךָ כִּי אֲנִי עֲבָדְךָ  
אֶעֱרֶךְ נִגְדְךָ מִחֶלֶל נֶחֱמָר

The Arabs allow some of the feet to be reduced to spondees. In this secondary form ha-Levi has a piyyūt,<sup>152</sup>

<sup>148</sup> *Reime und Gedichte des Abraham ibn Ezra*, 1885.

<sup>149</sup> *Meleket ha-Šir*, p. 15.

<sup>151</sup> *Die ersten Makamen*, p. 44.

<sup>150</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>152</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 128.

in which *fā'ilun* and *fa'lun* occur alternately. It may, therefore, be regarded as a Matadārik.

יְחֻד־נָא כָּל אִישׁ בְּטוֹב רִחְשׁוֹ

אֶל יְחֻדוֹ וְכִרּוֹ וְשֵׁם קִדְשׁוֹ

This piyyūt may also be regarded as a secondary Ḥafif, in which the last foot was shortened.

#### 14. Rajaz, *trembling*.

I place this metre last, not because it is the least frequent, but because of its peculiar character. It hardly possesses all the features of the other metres, which show a high stage of development. There is no doubt that it forms the connecting-link between rhymed prose (*saḡ*\*) and the other metres. It is chiefly employed, as was remarked above,<sup>153</sup> in extempore lines. The only stipulation of this metre seems to be that the lines should be approximately equal, and this differentiates it from rhymed prose. Its feet are composed of four syllables, and almost every possible combination is permitted. It is also catalectic. As a rule the hemistichs rhyme with each other. Furthermore, a poet is even allowed to have a hemistich of three feet and one of two feet in the same poem. This is best illustrated by the following lines by one of al-Find's daughters, who was inciting her clan to wage war:<sup>154</sup>

وَعَا وَعَا وَعَا وَحَا      حَرَّ الْحَرَارِ وَالْتِظَا  
وَمُلِئَتْ مِنْهُ الرِّبَا      يَا حَبَدَا الْمُحَلَقُونَ يَا ضُحَا

‘War, war, war, war! the fire was kindled and it raged!

The mounts were filled with it!

How fair in midday splendour are the shaven heads!’

<sup>153</sup> p. 185.

<sup>154</sup> Nöldeke, *Delectus*, p. 47.

In Hebrew to this metre may be assigned all those poems which have approximately equal lines, not exceeding twelve syllables in each hemistich, and do not fit in any other metre. In Egers's edition of Ibn Ezra's *Dīwān* there is a poem which bears the superscription וקאל ראנא *he composed a poem in the Rajaz form*. Egers remarks that it is incorrect, and refers to Kaempf. Of course it does not agree with Kaempf's Rajaz. But then Kaempf's Rajaz is really a Kāmīl,<sup>155</sup> and Ibn Ezra's poem is perhaps as good a Rajaz as any other. It is as follows: <sup>156</sup>

אודה לאל חיי חסדו שמני  
ממתים מחלד חלקם בחיים

Ha-Nagid has the following epigram which is catalectic: <sup>157</sup>

גבר אשר היטיב לי  
הרבה ולבו השחת  
פעם אני סולח  
ולבק אשר לו אחת

Perhaps to the same metre belongs the following piyyūt by ha-Levi: <sup>158</sup>

יחד באורה אל נאור  
העם אשר חלה חשן  
שברו ערי אן ימלשן  
יגור עקבו חטא נושן  
עליו כהם צח על אור  
ישכן אור

<sup>155</sup> See above, p. 185.

<sup>156</sup> p. 6.

<sup>157</sup> Harkavy's ed., p. 150.

<sup>158</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 9.

We thus have an example of dimeter and trimeter hemistichs in one and the same poem.

There is another class of poems which could be assigned to the shorter Kāmil without the *muraffal*, but may also belong to the Rajaz. That variation of Kāmil is as follows:

— 0 — 00 | — 0 — 00 || — 0 — 00 | — 0 — 00

Hassān b. Thābit praising his family says: <sup>159</sup>

الْمُطْعِمُونَ إِذَا سُو — نَ الْمَحْدُ تُصْبِحُ رَاكِدَةً

‘Who provide food when the years of drought afflict the land’ (literally: *become fixed*).

Owing to the rarity of this metre in Arabic I hesitated in assigning the Hebrew poems to it, and am prepared to yield to the opinion of other scholars to consider them as Rajaz, in spite of their uniformity. Ibn Gabirol has a long poem in this metre: <sup>160</sup>

מִה־לֶּךָ יְחִידָה הַשָּׁבִי      דּוֹמָה בְּמִלָּךְ בַּשָּׁבִי

Moses Ibn Ezra in *Taršīš* says: <sup>161</sup>

עוֹרָךְ נְדִיבִיתָךְ לְעֵב      עוֹרָךְ לְבוּשׁ שָׁקִים לְבָד  
אֲתָה בְּתוֹךְ שָׂרִים בָּמוֹ      נָבִיא וְהֵם דּוֹמִים לְבָד

### III

The fourteen metres enumerated above are directly borrowed from the Arabs, and practically cover the field of Arabic prosody. The remaining two metres mentioned by Arabian grammarians are Muḍārī' and Muḵṭaḍab. They are extremely rare in Arabic, and as far as now have

<sup>159</sup> *Diwān*, p. 77, no. 176, l. 5.

<sup>160</sup> Dukes' ed., p. 4.

<sup>161</sup> p. 16.

not been found prior to the grammarian al-Ḥalīl, who is the first to name them. It is the opinion of some scholars that these two metres together with Muḡtatt were invented by that grammarian.<sup>162</sup> Sa'adyā b. Dannān gives a Muḡārī', which, however, does not correspond to the Arabic. The normal form of the latter is

— | — — — — | — — — — || — | — — — — | — — — —

But Sa'adyā's line is as follows :<sup>163</sup>

בְּלִיעַל מְשֻׁל וְנִבְרָה יֵד בְּסֵל  
הַצְדִּיק אֲבֵד וְאִין אִישׁ שָׁם עַל לֵב

Brody agrees with Sa'adyā, and considers the following riddle as a Muḡārī' :<sup>164</sup>

הַפֶּה אֶת הַחֵיל וְגַם אֶת הָרֶכֶב  
וְחִמְצָא שָׁם דּוֹרֵי עָלֵי עֲרֻשׁוֹ שׁוֹכֵב

It is, however, quite obvious that this is no Muḡārī' which in Hebrew would have usually been, if we divided the feet differently :

— — — | — — — — — || — — — | — — — — —

If a poem whose syllables are thus disposed be found, it would be a Muḡārī', but those given above cannot claim to be recognized as belonging to this metre.

The metre given by Sa'adyā as Muḡtaḡab on p. 16 does not resemble the one bearing that name in Arabic.

Apart from these fourteen metres the Hebrew poets employed other combinations of short and long syllables. There is no need to give an exhaustive account of all of the variations. The *Dīwāns* of ha-Levi and Abraham Ibn

<sup>162</sup> See Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, II, p. 368, Rem.

<sup>163</sup> *Meleket ha-Šir*, p. 12.

<sup>164</sup> *Metra*, p. 40.

Ezra abound in instances. Some of these combinations closely resemble the regular metres. It should be noted that also the later Arabian poets have employed similar metres, and it is hard to say whether the Hebrew poets were the inventors of these combinations or followed Arabic models. This is, however, a minor point, since those variations were not sanctioned by the grammarians.

A few of the most typical of these variations may be given here.

(a) The following<sup>165</sup> is a combination of Madīd and Basīt:

— — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — — || — — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — — | — — — — —  
 שְׁלֹשׁוֹ קְדוֹשׁ וּבְשָׂרָפִים שְׁמוֹ קְדוֹשׁ  
 יַעֲנֶה אֶת מַחְלֵי יוֹצְרוֹ יִצִּיר נִעְנֶה

(b) A Tawīl with the second *fa'ūlun* omitted may be recognized in the following prayer by ha-Levi:<sup>166</sup>

יִרְחַם בְּךָ יְתוֹם אֲסִיר תִּקְוָה  
 וְלִבּוֹ בְּנַחֲלֵי הָעֲנִי נִבְּוָה

The concluding line of each strophe is half a Tawīl:

בְּאֲסִיר פְּרוּת חָלָם

As given in Harkavy's text there are numerous corruptions, but in his notes<sup>167</sup> he quotes variations which give better sense, and scan accurately. Thus instead of נִבְּוָה (line 17 a) which is substantiated by the rhyme and sense, his text has נִבְּוָה. In line 2 a vocalize מַחְכּוֹת (cp. Isa. 30. 18).

Abraham Ibn Ezra also has a prayer in a similar metre:<sup>168</sup>

אֵלֵהִי בְּגִלְיוֹתַי בְּךָ אֶחָסֶה  
 בְּצֶל חֶסֶדְךָ כָּל מַעְרוֹמֵי בָּסֶה

<sup>165</sup> *Ha-Levi*, ed. Harkavy, II, p. 6.

<sup>166</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>167</sup> II, p. 170.

<sup>168</sup> Egers's ed., p. 56.

(c) In a similar metre with the addition of an iamb at the end of the hemistich is the following contemplative poem by ha-Levi: <sup>169</sup>

יִשְׁנָה בְּחֵיק יְלָדוֹת לְמַתִּי תִשָּׁבְבִי  
דָּעִי כִּי נְעוּרִים פְּנֵעֶרֶת נִנְעָרוּ

(d) Ha-Levi also has a shortened Basīt: <sup>170</sup>

עַל אֶהְבֶּתְךָ אֵשֶׁתְּךָ נְבִיעִי  
שְׁלוֹם לְךָ שְׁלוֹם יוֹם הַשָּׁבִיעִי

(e) Ha-Nagid has a peculiar kind of Basīt in which the *mustaf'ilun* feet succeed each other without interruption: <sup>171</sup>

אַחַר אֲשֶׁר יִגְמַל חֲסָדִים בְּסִיל יָשׁוּב  
מִהֵר וְתִגְמְלִי חֲסָדָיו בְּרַע יוֹבִישׁ

(f) A peculiar kind of the shorter Kāmil is the following in which the second foot of the first hemistich has a *muraffal*: <sup>172</sup>

יִם סוּף וְסִינִי לְמִדּוּנִי  
אֶרֶץ יִרְדֵּי יֶאֱרַח

(g) A shortened Ḥafif is ha-Levi's piyyūt: <sup>173</sup>

יִזְכְּרוּ בְּלֶאֱדָה צָבָא מְרוֹם  
עַל גְּלִילִי וְבוֹל  
סוֹבְבִים חוּג בְּפִאֲתֵי דְרוֹם  
הוֹלְבִים עַל גְּבוּל

(h) A lengthened Munsariḥ is the following piyyūt by ha-Levi: <sup>174</sup>

מִי יִתְנַנִּי עֶבֶד אֱלֹהִים עוֹשֵׂנִי  
בְּכָל דּוֹר וְהוּא יִקְרִיבֵנִי

<sup>169</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 149.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 126.

<sup>171</sup> *Ša'ar ha-Šir*, p. 33.

<sup>172</sup> Harkavy, II, p. 27.

<sup>173</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.



In the same metre is the poem beginning יִדְעֵי יְגִדִּי.<sup>175</sup>

(i) Abraham Ibn Ezra has a shortened Munsariḥ: <sup>176</sup>

מִבֶּלְ בְּרִיאָה	חִיָּה עֲצוּמָה
דַּעְתָּה פְּלִיאָה	מִבֶּן אֲדָמָה

See also ha-Levi's poem beginning מָה לִּי וְלָכֶם.<sup>177</sup>

In addition to these metres there exist some in which the moving *šwās* are entirely neglected. In some cases the poets skilfully avoided those *šwās*. Sa'adyā b. Dannān calls it *the vowel metre* (נֶהָר הַתְּנוּעִי). A good deal of the poems composed in this kind of metre have seven syllables in each hemistich. This remarkably coincides with the Syriac metre. For the majority of the Homilies (*mēmre*) of the Syriac writers have seven vowels in each hemistich. This, however, does not signify that the Syrians influenced the Hebrew poets. Syriac poetry is chiefly christological, and its dull, unattractive tone would scarcely appeal to the keen imagination of the Hebrew poets.

There is no need to quote examples of this metre. Every reader can ascertain it for himself.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that editors in publishing *Dīwāns* would do well to divide the hemistichs into feet. The custom prevailing now is to prefix a row of curved and straight lines which make the reader no wiser, since those lines can be supplied by himself without difficulty.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>176</sup> Egers's ed., p. 24.

<sup>177</sup> Brody's ed., II, p. 251.